

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 3s. All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JANUARY 16, 1875.

CURRENT TOPICS.

IN LESS THAN A fortnight Parliament is to meet for the transaction of business, and it may be useful to recall some of the matters demanding the attention of our legislators. Passing over the Government Bills relating to the constitution of the Supreme Court of Appeal, the re-organization of the Irish Judicature, and the Land Transfer Bill—as to which last measure the profession now presents a united front on the ground we have always urged of non-compulsory registration and the establishment of district registries—we may anticipate the re-introduction of the Government Bills relating to friendly societies and county courts, and we may probably also look for a new Government measure dealing with the whole subject of the law of patents, and providing, *inter alia*, for the preliminary examination recommended by the Committee on the Patent Laws in their report of 1872. If the Bill also makes provision for the reduction of the fees connected with specifications and for rendering the grant on fair terms of licences to use patents compulsory, a long step will be taken towards removing the objections urged against the present system. If, in addition to these measures, the intention ascribed to the Government of introducing a Bill to render compulsory the enfranchisement of copyholds should prove to have been persisted in, it must be admitted that the prospects of the session as regards law reform are by no means barren.

Turning to measures not yet known to be under the wing of the Government, one of the most pressing of these is the often-shelved Juries Bill. Surely the importance of the subject, and the facts that the Bill of which Mr. Lopes had charge last session has been three times already before Parliament, that it was originally framed by the Government, and that it has passed through the ordeal of a select committee, ought to induce the Administration to take it up and press it through early in the coming session. Another matter on which legislation is greatly needed is the present condition of the law relating to the registration of bills of sale, under which a bill of sale, though given on the understanding that it is not to be registered, but to be renewed over and over again, within the statutory period for registration of twenty-one days, is nevertheless good against an execution creditor. At the same time we may hope that a broad and easily intelligible rule will be laid down by the Legislature with reference to the important question of the registration of mortgages of premises including trade fixtures. Leading authorities, both in the legal and commercial world, have advocated the establishment of the principle that trade fixtures of the kind usually belonging to a tenant, whether annexed to freehold or leasehold premises, shall not be capable of being taken out of a trader's general estate, except by a registered deed. Sir Henry James's Bill, relating to the remuneration and liabilities of returning officers, of which we treat in another column, will probably pass through Parliament without any great

controversy, and so also may Sir C. O'Loughlen's Bill to declare the law as to throwing away of votes at parliamentary elections, if the hon. gentleman should think it necessary to re-introduce it. The progress of Lord Selborne's Bills for the re-organization of the Inns of Court, and the establishment of a general school of law, is likely to be keenly contested; and it is clear that if they are to pass at all they must undergo some modification. Upon the question of the establishment of public prosecutors, in accordance with the recent report of the Judicature Commissioners, no public pledge has yet been given, but it is much to be hoped that the matter will be brought before Parliament. And will no member devote his energies to procuring the passing of a Bill defining and limiting that dangerous jurisdiction of committing for contempt of court, under which, as we have often pointed out, the judges are silently usurping a paternal and arbitrary administration of fine and imprisonment?

CANON LIDDON stated last week in a letter to the *Times* that prayers for the dead have been expressly declared legal in the Church of England. We presume that this assertion is founded upon Sir H. Jenner Fust's decision in *Brecks v. Woolfrey* (1 Curteis, 880); but that case certainly does not settle the law upon the question. It was there held that an inscription on a tombstone in Carisbrook churchyard begging for prayers for the soul of the deceased was lawful, but, as Dr. Liddon would find if the experiment were tried, it is one thing to allow such an inscription to be placed on a monument in a churchyard and quite another to allow prayers for the dead to be used during the services of the Church. To the latter case the now firmly-established and well-known principle that no omission from or addition to the prescribed form can be permitted is applicable (see *Westerton v. Liddell*, Moore's Report). Moreover, prayers for the dead were, it must be remembered, included in the first prayer-book of Edward the Sixth, and are excluded from the present book, and would, therefore, now be illegal upon the principle on which the mixed chalice, which was ordered by the former prayer-book, and not ordered in the latter, has already been pronounced illegal. The mistake into which Dr. Liddon has fallen is a very natural one for a writer unacquainted with the legal effect of the more recent decisions in our ecclesiastical courts. But any advocate who should attempt to justify prayers for the dead in the Church service on the authority of *Brecks v. Woolfrey* would find he had undertaken a hopeless task.

IF WE MAY JUDGE FROM THE OBSERVATIONS of chairmen of quarter sessions, as reported in the daily journals, it does not seem very likely that the Home Secretary will obtain any great assistance in coming to a conclusion as to the advisability of extending the administration of corporal punishment. Opinion seems to be divided, and it is not always very clearly expressed. What, for instance, is Mr. Cross to make of the recommendation of the East Suffolk magistrates, thus expressed by Lord Waverley? "We thought it right that where the brutal nature is so far developed that the ordinary slow processes of punishment do not tend to lessen the crime, a rapid and sharp punishment should be inflicted; and, much as we respect what is called the sanctity of the human body, still it appeared to us in cases of this kind that corporal punishment is a fitting preliminary to the other punishment that may be awarded by the law." Nor can we think that the suggestion of Mr. Digby Seymour, Q.C., at the Newcastle Quarter Sessions, that chairmen of quarter sessions should be entrusted with the power of decreeing judicial separation in cases of "habitual cruelty" towards a wife, though certainly original and not without plausibility, affords a satisfactory solution of the wife-beating difficulty. But another of Mr. Seymour's proposals seems to us to be worthy of some

consideration. Before discussing the question of whether the existing penalties for crimes of violence should be altered or added to, it is obviously advisable to inquire rather carefully into the mode in which those penalties have been administered. It seems to be admitted on all hands that judges and magistrates have been in the habit of imposing sentences ridiculously disproportionate to the offences, especially in cases of wife beating. It is easy to see one of the motives which has led to this course. Shutting up the husband in prison, as matters stand at present, means further injuring the already injured wife, by depriving her and her family of the means of subsistence. Now Mr. Seymour would in future inflict a heavy term of imprisonment on the criminal, and provide that he should work in prison, and that the proceeds of his work should be devoted to paying the expenses of the wife and maintaining her. If any provision of this kind were practicable, it would tend to remove that reluctance to deprive the wives and families of criminals of their means of support which is at the bottom of much of the reluctance to inflict adequate terms of imprisonment for wife beating.

As to the general subject, it is clear that the extension of corporal punishment might be attended with grave consequences to the moral character of the community, and therefore can only be justified on the assumption that the present system is radically defective. Hence the real point at issue is not whether flogging is a deterrent or not, but whether the existing punishment for crimes of violence, if properly administered, would not be a sufficient deterrent. Let judges and magistrates throughout the country adopt and act upon a similar resolution to that passed the other day at Sheffield—"to show no leniency on any account to persons who come before them charged with committing aggravated assaults," and we shall then be in a position to decide as to whether the existing system of punishment for crimes of violence needs supplementing in the manner proposed.

THE VACANCY IN THE TAXING MASTERS' OFFICE, caused by the death of Mr. Johnson, has recalled attention to the importance of the early adoption of measures to meet the constantly recurring complaints of delay and difficulty in procuring speedy appointments for taxation. Doubtless the taxing masters work with energy during office hours, but are not those hours fixed on a somewhat too lenient scale? It appears that the office is open on 215 days of the year for six hours a day, and on 61 days for two hours a day; making 276 days altogether on which the office is open. But taking an equivalent number of days' work in the year at six hours per day, the number of days is only 235. It can hardly be supposed that the suggestion of the Legal Departments Commissioners that six hours a day should in future be required throughout the year, with two months' holiday for each officer, would be an undue strain upon the energies of the taxing masters.

WE ARE REQUESTED TO STATE that any suggestions to the Bankruptcy Committee appointed by the Lord Chancellor may be addressed to them at the Treasury.

SOME QUESTIONS ON THE LAW OF RATING.

VERY nice questions frequently arise as to the validity of rates and the effect of any illegality or irregularity in them, either of form or substance. There is a well-known distinction between rates that are voidable and rates that are void. The former class are good until quashed by the sessions, the latter are nullities *ab initio*; and any attempt to enforce them by distress exposes the party distraining to an action. This distinction is in itself sufficiently easy of apprehension, but it is not altogether easy to gather from the decisions of reported cases

the exact principles which may afford in all cases a rule according to which the rate will fall within one class or the other. In our researches we have met with decisions involving this question in relation to various sorts of rates, the principles of which we find very great difficulty in reconciling. In the law of rating, as in the case of other branches of the law which have to some extent crystallized out of usage and practice, there is, in respect of many matters, an absence of any attempt to lay down fundamental principles; the law is an aggregation of individual instances, as to each of which it sufficed the tribunal charged with the decision if it could see its way to the particular point in hand without troubling itself to include such point in a large and comprehensive rule. For instance, there has never been an attempt, as far as we know, to define the nature and effect of the document termed a rate, considered as an instrument, apart from what we may term its merely documentary effect, or to determine upon what general principles such nature and effect may depend. We mean by the distinction between documentary and instrumental effect to indicate the distinction between effect of a merely evidential character and efficacy *per se*. There is nothing in the Statute of Elizabeth that, at the origin of the poor-rate, expressly required a writing, but the inconvenience, and even impossibility, of levying a rate without a writing seem to have caused it to be always assumed as an elementary rule that the rate must be embodied in a document. What, however, is the exact legal efficacy of such document has never been accurately defined, but it will be found, nevertheless, that this question very often mixes itself up with the question whether a rate is void. We purpose very briefly discussing some of the points which arise turning on the question, to which we have before alluded, as to whether a rate is void or only voidable. Want of space would render it impossible for us to go minutely into all the authorities relating to the particular subjects we propose to discuss. All we can do is to indicate what appear to us to be sound general principles derived from reason and convenience as applied to the subject of rating, leaving it to our readers in any particular case to determine how far it is still open to the courts to apply such principles, or how far the case is concluded by actual decision.

It may in the first place be laid down as an elementary proposition, which will not be disputed with regard to the question when a rate is void, that in order that a rate may be good it must be made in pursuance of the authority given by the law to make it. But, like most general propositions, the difficulty lies in the application. When may a rate be said to be made in pursuance of the authority given to make it? Now in this question is involved a distinction often mentioned in the decisions, but the exact limits and nature of which it is not very easy to gather, between defects apparent on the face of the rate and defects not so apparent. In determining the nature of this distinction it is obvious that there is involved the question, above referred to, as to the exact nature and effect of the document called a rate. It has been held that a poor rate without a title—i.e., which does not on the face of it show that it is made for the purpose of the relief of the poor—is absolutely void. We have before seen that by established practice an outward and visible embodiment in a document is essential to the legal existence of a rate. It now, therefore, further appears from the decisions that it is an essential part of the outward and visible existence of a rate that it should show that it is made for the purposes for which the making of a rate is authorized. Without this feature there is no rate existing in the eye of the law, any more than a watch can be said to exist without figures on the dial.

So far all is clear, but from these apparently simple principles questions of considerable difficulty may and do arise. Admitting that a rate must pursue the authority or jurisdiction given to make it, and that it must be embodied in a document showing on the face of it under

what authority it purports to be made, the question arises, first, how far the outward form of it is conclusive, or how far you are entitled to go behind the face of it with reference to the question whether it is made in pursuance of the authority: and secondly, how far any deviation from the authority, apparent on the face of it, would render it void altogether. With respect to the first question, let us assume that, though purporting to make the rate for the authorized purposes, the rating authorities in fact estimated for, and intended to apply a portion of the rate to illegal or unauthorized purposes, and let us also assume that in the particular case it could be proved that they did so. This is quite a conceivable case in respect of some rates, e.g., the general district rate, where an estimate has to be published before making the rate. It may be very forcibly urged that as there is no express statutory effect given to the document called a rate, and there is no ancient principle of law applicable to it, as to a record for instance, whereby it is made conclusive of facts stated in it, it must stand or fall according to the fact of its being made in pursuance of the authority or not, and therefore, though on the face of it made for legal purposes, it is altogether void. On the other hand the voice of expediency speaks very strongly on the matter: it is practically extremely inconvenient that a rate good on the face of it should be altogether void and a nullity because there may be some trifling illegal item included in it. The decisions on this subject do not seem very clear. There are some decisions which seem to tend to the doctrine that in such a case the face of the rate is absolutely conclusive, and the objection can only be to the application of the rate to the illegal purpose, not to the making of it for such purpose. Some seem to show that the rate in such a case would be void, and others that it would be voidable merely on appeal. It must be observed that the decisions to which we allude concern different sorts of rates—poor rates, borough rates, church rates, district rates, and so forth—and though there may not be a conflict as to the law with regard to any one particular rate, it is very difficult on general principles to reconcile them all. We would call particular attention to the comparatively recent case of *Local Board of Luton v. Davis* (8 W. R. 411, 2 E. & E. 678). We cannot but hope that it may be found possible to apply the principle involved in that decision as widely as possible in cases of rating of whatever sort in future, though the decision, in point of fact, only applied to a general district rate under the Public Health Act. The decision in that case was that the rate is conclusive as to the purpose for which it is levied as long as it is not quashed, though it may be objected to on appeal. The ground on which it appears to us that this is the correct principle is, that the mere fact that on making the rate the rating authority estimate for, and intend to apply the rate to, an illegal purpose, does not cause the rate to be made for that purpose. The purpose to which the rate is solely applicable by law is the purpose for which it is made in law, and this purpose is truly stated on the face of the document that is the outward embodiment of it. The fact that there may be an intention in future to apply it illegally, and that, acting on such intention, the rating authority may have raised more than they actually want for the authorized purpose, does not cause the rate to be one which in law is made otherwise than in pursuance of the authority given. This may easily be seen from the undisputed fact that the application to the illegal purpose may be objected to on audit of the accounts of the rating authority. For the law would be blowing hot and cold, if it could both say that the money was not raised for legal purposes and that it was so raised, and therefore you must account for it by showing that it was applied to such purposes. The law says that being raised under cover of a certain authority it is conclusively presumed to be raised for the authorized purposes. It seems to us, however, that the doctrine that the rate in such a case is not the subject of appeal goes as much too far in one direction as the

doctrine that it is absolutely void goes in the other. If an illegal purpose is estimated for, the ratepayers may clearly be aggrieved by the levying of an unduly large rate at a particular period. The remedy by objection to the application of the rate obviously would not remove their grievance.

Up to this point there does not seem to be much theoretical difficulty in dealing on a satisfactory basis with the subject we have proposed to ourselves for discussion. But there is the second question which we adverted to, viz., as to the effect of a rate which shows on the face of it that it is made wholly or partially for unauthorized purposes. There seems to us in that case to be some difficulty in the application of the principles we have laid down. We must, however, reserve this question for another occasion.

RETURNING OFFICERS' CHARGES.

IN the midst of the general inconvenience caused by the suddenness of the announcement of the dissolution of Parliament last February, few persons had more substantial ground for complaint than the returning officers of the United Kingdom. Called upon, as they were in many instances, with but a few days' notice, to put in force for the first time the elaborate provisions of the Ballot Act, to select new polling-places, to retain and instruct a competent staff of deputies and clerks, to engage carpenters to erect the necessary fittings, to order stationery and ballot-boxes, and to provide for the transmission, custody, and counting of ballot-papers, they had a heavy task to perform; and it speaks well for their energy that the unfortunate break-down in the borough of Hackney should have been the sole instance in which an election failed to be properly carried out. Still, enough transpired during the course of the general election to show that the present system is unsatisfactory, alike to returning officers and candidates. The Reform Act of 1832 (section 71) gives the returning officer power to allot the expenses of polling-booths between the several candidates, the maximum cost being fixed in counties at £40 for each place of election or polling-place, and in boroughs at £25 for each parish, district, or part. The Ballot Act, 1872, by section 8, throws upon the returning officer the obligation of providing nomination papers, polling-stations, ballot-boxes and papers, stamping instruments, and all other things necessary, and of appointing and paying officers, and doing all other things necessary to the effectual conduct of the election, such expenses (when properly incurred) to be payable in the same way as expenses of erecting polling-booths had been previously payable. The practice has been for the returning officer to make an estimate of all the costs likely to be incurred; to divide the amount between the candidates actually nominated; to demand the several proportions at the nomination, and afterwards to return any overplus which may remain in his hands at the close of the election. The case of *Davis v. Lord Kensington* (22 W. R. 707), however, shows that a candidate is not bound to provide money in advance to meet the election expenses, and that his prepayment of such expenses cannot be made a condition precedent to the acceptance of his nomination by the returning officer. In strictness, therefore, the returning officer is bound to provide for the election expenses, and must take his chance of being repaid such expenses by the candidates.

It was in this state of things that Sir Henry James introduced into the House of Commons a measure for defining more clearly the rights and duties of returning officers, and at the same time limiting the liabilities with which they have the power to burden candidates. The Bill authorized the returning officer to demand from all candidates a deposit of, or security for, what he might consider the necessary expenses of the election, and in the event of any candidate failing to provide the allotted deposit or security

his nomination was to be void. On the other hand the candidate's interests were to be protected by a power of taxing the returning officer's charges, and by the *maximum* charges fixed in the schedule, not only for the officer's own remuneration, but also for each item of his expenditure. The Bill was well received by the House, but Sir H. James, on the second reading, suggested that it should be referred to a select committee, as well for the purpose of eliciting the views of the returning officers as of deciding on the scale of allowances in the schedule. The Home Secretary assented to this course, subject only to the understanding that the committee should not have power to entertain any question as to the policy of transferring the election expenses from the candidates to the ratepayers. The select committee held several sittings for the purpose of going through the clauses and schedules of the Bill, and examined returning officers from various classes of constituencies. The amended Bill was reported to the House in July, only in time to furnish another victim in "the massacre of the innocents." The evidence given before the committee has since been printed, and it not only illustrates the manifold difficulties which occurred in the preparations for the holding of the late elections, but also discloses some startling inequalities of position as regards returning officers' remuneration.

The recent general election being the first under the Ballot Act, much expense was caused by the necessity of providing at a short notice the ballot boxes and stamping instruments, and also the wooden fittings necessary for the reception of the votes at the various polling places. Some difference of opinion was expressed as to the proper mode of dealing with these articles. Thus, Mr. Mullings, the Town Clerk of Cricklade, considers that the ballot boxes are the property of the candidates, who should be paid for their use at a future election, and Mr. Southall, Town Clerk of Worcester, concurs in this opinion. On the other hand, the returning officer for the Flintshire boroughs seems to have bought the ballot boxes, perforating machines, &c., and charged the candidates at the recent election one-fourth only of the cost. It appears that in this happy constituency there has been no contested election for the last twenty-one years, and if this state of things continues, it may, as the acting Town Clerk of Flint remarks, be a long time before the returning officer has his outlay recouped. In the city of London the ballot boxes, &c., are the property of the Corporation; and at Manchester, the ballot boxes used at the last election were a part of the city property, having been previously used at the School Board election, and the candidates were charged a sum for their use. At Leeds nothing was charged to the candidates for stamping instruments or ballot boxes. As regards the timber for the partitions and other fittings of the polling stations, a similar want of uniform practice appears. At Manchester it was provided specially for the purpose of the election, because of the cost which would be incurred by warehousing it if retained. Mr. Abbott, the Under-Sheriff of Surrey, however, has not been oppressed by this difficulty, for he has had the wood-work used during the East Surrey polling securely lodged in the county gaol, ready for a future emergency. At the last Liverpool election ingenious portable polling stations were used, and were paid for out of the borough fund.

Almost all the witnesses concur in the opinion that if more time had been allowed for the election the expense would have been very greatly diminished; and this consideration may afford some consolation to intending candidates, who would otherwise be alarmed at the somewhat startling increase in expenses as shown in some cases over those at the election in 1868. Thus in East Worcestershire the returning officer's expenses have risen from £752 15s. 9d. to £1,415 15s. 6d., at Cricklade, from £281 to £580; and at Nottingham, from £547 to nearly £900. On the other hand, in Manchester the cost in 1868 was £1,336 8s. 3d., and in 1874, only £121 more,

the total cost of the latter election being less than 6d. per voter on the register. And at Liverpool, where there have been two parliamentary elections since the Ballot Act came into operation, the expenses of the second were between £300 and £400 less than those of the first. In the city of Worcester the election expenses fell from £343 9s. 2d. in 1868 to £280 in 1874.

A good deal of discussion took place before the committee as to the remuneration of the presiding officers, which averaged from two guineas to five guineas, but the witnesses concur in stating that responsible persons could hardly be engaged on a lower scale than was adopted. In Liverpool no fewer than 146 solicitors were required as presiding officers, and they received £3 10s. 6d. each, but this charge included cab hire and refreshments. In Manchester only two guineas were paid to the presiding officers, but the town clerk explained that refreshments were provided for them, and he stated that there was much difficulty in inducing professional men to act for this fee. The committee, in the schedule to their amended Bill, have adopted the sum of three guineas as the fee for the presiding officer.

The most important question for the consideration of the committee was that of the remuneration of the returning officers. The differences in the amounts received by them in different places are very considerable. Thus, the Secondary of London, who is nominally the sheriff's deputy, but in effect the sole returning officer of the city of London, charged a fee of one hundred guineas as deputy returning officer, a "customary" fee of ten guineas on receipt of writ and notice of election, four guineas for attendance at nomination and receipt and publication of papers, twenty guineas for casting up votes and declaring poll; he also received fees for preparing "deputations" to presiding officers and for verifying registers, making on the whole a remuneration of nearly £180. The Town Clerk of Manchester charged a fee of fifty guineas for performing the actual duties of returning officer as the mayor's deputy. The Town Clerk and deputy returning officer of Cricklade, a borough covering several rural parishes, charged £120. As to counties, it appears that the Under-Sheriff of the town and county of the town of Nottingham has always charged a fee of thirty guineas to each candidate, amounting, at the last election, to a total fee of 180 guineas. The Under-Sheriff of Surrey always charges from £70 to £100 for a contested election and £50 where there is no contest. In Essex the returning officer charged £150 at the last contested election, and £50 at the last uncontested election. On the other hand, in Scotland the sheriff, who is the returning officer, is paid nothing in respect of the election, and the sheriff's clerk receives, as a general rule, only his disbursements and travelling and personal expenses.

The main provisions of the Bill, in its amended form, are these:—By section 2 the returning officer is entitled to be paid for services and expenses not exceeding the sums mentioned in the first schedule, the amount to be divided among all the candidates. By section 3 he may require security, the total of which is regulated by the *maximum* charges in the 3rd schedule, which are fixed according to population, the scale in counties and districts of contributory boroughs being higher than that in single towns. The security is to be given within one hour after the expiration of the two hours fixed for the completion of the nominations, and any candidate failing to give or tender security will be disqualified; the security to be by deposit of any legal tender, or in any other way to which the returning officer may consent, and any surplus to be divided among the candidates after the election. By section 4 the returning officer must, within twenty-one days after the return is made, transmit to each candidate an account of his charges, and the proportion claimed from such candidate, and state where the various vouchers may be inspected; he is not to be entitled to any charge not included in the account, and the candidate may, within fourteen days

from the receipt of the account, apply to the court for taxation of the charges, which may, after taxation, be enforced as a judgment. The taxing court is to be, in London the Mayor's Court, in other parts of England the county court, and in Ireland the Civil Bill Court; but all the powers under the Act may be deputed to the registrar or other principal officer of the court. By section 6 no returning officer is to be liable on any claim for services or other expenses incurred about the election if not sent in within fourteen days after the date of the return, and he may submit them to be taxed in the same way as his own claims against the candidates. Section 7 provides that ballot-boxes, compartments, &c., used in municipal elections shall, as far as possible, be made use of in borough elections. The 1st schedule makes very elaborate provisions for all the items of the returning officer's expenses, both for disbursements and personal remuneration, part I. referring to counties, groups of boroughs, as well as the boroughs of Aylesbury, Cricklade, Retford, Malmesbury, Shoreham, and Monmouth, and part II. to all other boroughs. The returning officer is to receive the following fees:—For preparing and publishing notice of election, £2 2s. 0d.; for preparing and supplying nomination papers, £1 1s. 0d.; for making return to clerk of crown, £1 1s. 0d.; for preparing and publishing notices (after notice of election), a maximum of £20 for all notices, and £1 for every 1,000 electors above 3,000; for services and expenses as to receipt and publication of election expenses, £1 1s. 0d. for each candidate; and for all other expenses (a) under part I., a maximum of £10, and £1 for every 1,000 electors (or fraction of 1,000) over 1,000, if the election is contested, but nil if there be no contest; (b) under part II., a maximum of £10 per 1,000 electors, and £1 for every additional 1,000 (whether there is a contest or not). The fee of a presiding officer, as we have said, is fixed at three guineas, and that of a clerk at one guinea (with one shilling per mile travelling expenses in all constituencies included in part I.), and each counter of votes is also to receive one guinea. All the items of expenses are elaborately enumerated.

Recent Decisions.

EQUITY.

NUISANCE INJURIOUS TO VEGETATION.

Salvin v. The North Brancepeth Coal Company (Limited), L.J., 22 W. R. 904.

This case is valuable for the clearness with which it has laid down the principles which should guide the Court of Chancery in dealing with applications for injunctions to restrain the carrying on of works alleged to produce smoke and vapours deleterious to vegetation. The point the plaintiff applying for an injunction has to prove is, that he has sustained, or is about to sustain, such injury as at law would entitle him to substantial—or, to use the recent expression of the Master of the Rolls (*Aynsley v. Glover*, 23 W. R. 147), "considerable"—damages. But how is he to prove this? Is the court to refuse an injunction whenever the plaintiff cannot show actual and substantial damage such as would make a case which might be laid before a jury? or is the court to act upon the affidavits of scientific men as to the probability of injury, and upon certain theories of which it will take judicial cognizance? At one time there seems to have been an inclination towards this latter course. In *Broadbent v. Imperial Gas Company* (5 W. R. 272, 3 Jur. N. S. 221) Lord Cranworth said there were two or three patent facts that he thought he might decide upon. One was that some of the witnesses deposed that they found the leaves of trees grimed on the surface with "an unreasonable quantity of smoke." Another

was, "that one of the scientific witnesses deposes to this, which I do not find satisfactorily contradicted, that upon taking away a portion of the bark, trying it first by chemical analysis and then by microscope, he found crystals which were the result of sulphuric and other acids. . . . I would not have believed all the chemists in the world if they told me that was not injurious to vegetation." This language would appear to sanction the notion that, given scientific evidence of the existence of sulphur crystals between the bark and the wood, the court would draw a conclusive inference of present, or at any rate of prospective, injury to the tree, and upon that would grant the injunction sought. This notion the Lords Justices, in the recent case, have wholly disavowed. The rule they have laid down is, that in order to entitle himself to an injunction the plaintiff must prove that "actual and substantial damage" has occurred; mere evidence of prospective or contingent damage will not suffice. This is equivalent to saying that the court will never in this class of cases interfere to prevent substantial damage from occurring for the first time; and this deviation from the general rule is justified by Mellish, L.J., on the ground that "in nuisances of this particular kind it is known by experience that it is impossible to be certain that substantial damage ever will be sustained unless substantial damage actually has been sustained." The court has also laid down as another requisite to entitle the plaintiff to an injunction that the damage should be "capable of being shown by a plain witness to a plain common jurymen." When damage of this kind is once proved, scientific evidence may be admitted to explain its causes, but such evidence alone will not suffice. The ground for this rule resembles that given for the other. "As a matter of fact, in cases of a nuisance of this description, unless the damage is proved to have been such, that—I will not say every ignorant eye, but—every fairly-instructed eye can really see it in the wood itself, it is impossible to be certain that substantial damage has really been sustained."

COMMON LAW.

POOR LAW—ASSESSMENT.

R. v. Bedminster Union Assessment Committee, Q.B., 22 W. R. 943.

R. v. Edmonds, Q.B., 22 W. R. 944, L. R. 9 Q. B. 598.

It may be convenient to notice the effect of these two cases. The first decides that no ground of objection can be taken, on an appeal against a rate made under a valuation list, which has not been taken on the complaint which the Union Assessment Act, 1864, s. 1, requires to be made to the Assessment Committee as a condition precedent to the right to appeal, and this although the committee may be unable to give relief on that ground. The second decides a point of considerable practical importance, though one of no real difficulty when the complicated legislation on this subject is once understood. It is that the formalities of re-deposit required by the Union Assessment Act of 1862, on the alteration of a valuation list before its final completion, are not applicable to an alteration made in a completed valuation list in pursuance of section 1 of the Act of 1864.

At the Wiltshire Quarter Sessions last week Mr. Henry Alworth Merewether, Q.C., announced his intention of resigning the chairmanship of the court in consequence of ill-health. Mr. Merewether was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1837, and became a Queen's Counsel in 1853, and was for a long time one of the leaders of the parliamentary bar. He is also Recorder of Devizes. At the sitting of the court on the following day Mr. Wyndham Slade expressed on behalf of the members of the sessions bar their regret at Mr. Merewether's intended resignation, and their sense of the kindness and courtesy they had always received at his hands.

Notes.

IN THE CASE OF *Re the Brompton and Longtown Railway Company*, heard by the Court of Appeal in Chancery on Thursday, the appeal was dismissed with costs without hearing the respondents. The appellants had given notice to read on the appeal some affidavits which had been filed in the matter but not used on the original hearing; but these affidavits were not in fact read upon the appeal, the court deciding the case upon a ground independent of them. The respondents' counsel, after the judgment had been pronounced, stated that he should have objected to the admission of these affidavits, and he asked that the appellants might be ordered to pay the costs occasioned by the respondents, having taken copies of them. Inasmuch as the affidavits in question, not having been read, would not be entered in the order dismissing the appeal, the respondents could not get the costs of them without a special order. The Lord Chancellor said that the respondents had not pursued the proper course. They ought not to have taken copies of the affidavits in the first instance, but they should have stated on the opening of the appeal that they objected to their admission, and then, if the court decided to admit them, they should have asked that the hearing might be adjourned to give them time to take copies. They could not be allowed to blow hot and cold, and, while objecting to the admissibility of the affidavits, to insist that they should be entered in the order merely for the purpose of getting the costs of them.

YESTERDAY the Lords Justices affirmed the decision of Mr. Registrar Hazlitt in *Re Sydney and Wiggins* (ante, p. 183), on which we commented last week (ante, p. 169). The question, as our readers will remember, was whether, after debtors had filed a liquidation petition, under which their creditors agreed to accept a composition, payable by instalments, they could, before the instalments had been all paid, file a fresh petition, under which their creditors, old and new together, could pass valid resolutions to accept a composition smaller in amount than the first. Mr. Registrar Hazlitt confirmed the refusal of Mr. Registrar Keene to register the resolutions passed under the second petition. The Lords Justices upheld this decision, on the ground that a debtor who has once instituted proceedings for either liquidation or composition is, until these have come to an end, not free to commence any other proceedings which would interfere with the rights of the creditors under the first proceedings.

SOME ENTERPRISING YOUNG MAN at Lincoln's-inn or the Temple should take to heart a suggestion made by a correspondent of the *Central Law Journal*. It appears that lent law books, in America as in England, do not always find their way back to the shelves of their owners, and here is the mode in which our American brethren are exhorted to remedy the grievance:—"Let all the lawyers of a town or city unite in the employment of some worthy, quick, and capable young student, whose duty it must be to make out and keep up a complete, classified catalogue of every library in the place. This catalogue should show every book in every library, its date, edition, editor, and owner, and copies of the original (which should not leave the custody of the librarian) could be furnished by the librarian, at a slight cost, to every lawyer who desires it. It should be the duty of this librarian to make frequent periodical visits to each library, noting changes, loans and returns, books missing and found, and to 'keep the run' of every volume, searching for those unaccounted for, and as far as possible keeping all in their proper places. This labour, once reduced to a system, would be very slight, and the compensation therefore, contributed by so many, could be easily adjusted, and paid without hardship to any individual. If there exists no law association through which the matter could be arranged, let some enterprising student take hold of it and secure subscriptions, or go on without subscriptions, and as soon as the utility and value of the plan is demonstrated, every lawyer who has

the slightest feeling of regard for his books, or sentiment of justice and gratitude for a service rendered, will gladly join in the good work. Besides this, the simple contact with the books, and acquired familiarity with their names, dates, editions, editors, authors, contents, and relative value, will, in itself, furnish the librarian with a fund of information scarcely less valuable than his course of reading."

IN A RECENT CASE before the New Hampshire Appeal Court of *Gray v. Jackson* (51 N. H. 9), where the question arose whether, where a common carrier between P. and B. takes a package at P. for B., a place in another State beyond his terminus, he undertakes as a carrier beyond B., the bench quoted the following language of Senator Bookee in the case of *Van Sanford v. St. John* (6 Hill, 157):—"Suppose the box had been marked 'Brown's Hole, Rocky Mountains,'" says the learned judge, if the law implies a contract to deliver the box at that place, as it is the duty of every man faithfully to fulfil his contracts, the carrier "must abandon his ordinary avocations and business, leave the delights of domestic association, embark with his dear-bought freight, and follow the long lines of internal navigation until he reaches the head-waters of the Yellow Stone. Then he must traverse a vast desert, with Indian horses and pack saddles, exposed to famine, to the wintry storms, to wild beasts and savages; and if Providence should protect him through every danger, he returns, after years of suffering, a worn-out beggar to a ruined home." This language, says the *Albany Law Journal*, was quite effectual in its day, but the journey to "Brown's Hole" nowadays is a very different affair, and instead of being tedious, perilous, or difficult, is a much-sought recreation. The senator's law is still good, but his rhetoric has lost its force.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF BENCHERS of the four Inns of Court some time ago appointed to consider the subject of Lord Selborne's two Bills, which were brought into Parliament on July 10, 1874, have unanimously come to the following resolutions:—1. "That Lord Selborne's Bill to incorporate the Inns of Court and interfere with their property and internal management having been introduced into Parliament notwithstanding the unanimous resolution of the joint committee of the four Inns of the 4th of March, 1874, disapproving of his original draft Bill, a resolution since confirmed by each of the four Inns, this committee resolve that the four societies be recommended to take all proper steps for opposing such Bill in Parliament if again brought in." 2. "That this committee disapprove of Lord Selborne's Bill for establishing a general school of law, and especially of the provision contained in it whereby students for the bar and the articled clerks of solicitors shall be under one joint system, and are of opinion that the legal education of students for the bar should continue to be under the control of their own branch of the profession."

THE NEW LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND.

ON the opening of the Appeal Court at Dublin on the first day of Hilary Term the bar benches were filled with ladies. The gallery was thronged, and the entrances at either side of the bar benches were blocked to the doors by a closely-packed crowd. Before this assemblage, representing all classes in society, a Mr. Barnes presented himself an hour before the Chancellor came on the bench, carrying, says *Saunders' News Letter*, the now familiar walking-stick, adorned with a white ribbon. Fixing his eye-glasses in position, he smilingly surveyed the gathering, and then proceeded to improve the very fine opportunity which offered for delivering one of his characteristic addresses. He spoke upon nearly every public question of the time—the bench, the legal profession, the coming university election, &c. Whilst he was in full swing, there appeared in his vicinity two policemen, who looked as if they really meant business. Mr. Barnes, perceiving this, retired, declaring, as he did so, that it was an illegal interference with the liberty of the subject, but that, except for the principle involved, it didn't matter, inasmuch as he had said all he

came there to say, and his mission was accomplished. When outside the door of the court, he carefully made a note of the numbers of the policemen who had escorted him out, after which he delivered a brief but vigorous address of a very general character, winding up with the expression of a hope that a Prime Minister would soon make his appearance who would have the manliness and the courage honestly to steer the ship of State through the waters of politics, or something to that effect. Shortly after one o'clock the Lord Chancellor, the Right Hon. John Thomas Ball, came on the bench, accompanied by the Master of the Rolls, and the Vice-Chancellor, and attended by his lordship's secretary (Mr. Lawson), and his purse-bearer and train-bearer. His lordship was greeted with warm applause by the crowded court. The Master of the Rolls and the Vice-Chancellor having retired, the list was called over, and the court soon after adjourned.

THE "PALL MALL GAZETTE" ON SOLICITORS.

"An Attorney" writes as follows to the *Pall Mall Gazette* of Monday, with reference to an article which recently appeared in that journal on the organization of the legal profession:—"It requires but a limited perception to divine that the writer of the article which appeared in your issue of the 5th inst. under the above title is a member of the legal profession, and, further, that he belongs not to that branch of it whose acquirements in the study of law he damns with such excessively faint praise, but to that other branch on behalf of which he would advocate the continuance of a system which, I venture to say, is without parallel in its incidents, and—what is more to the point in so far as the general public is concerned—is most injurious to suitors. I confine myself in dealing with the writer's observations to that portion of your article in which a distinction is attempted to be drawn between the relative legal attainments of the two branches of the profession. The writer lays it down as a broad proposition that nineteen-twentieths or more of an attorney's time is occupied with affairs in which he has no occasion to know more law 'than every one who knows any law at all can carry in his head.' And he then, waxing bolder as it were in his progress, proceeds to state that the most eminent attorneys neither know nor profess to know more than the broad general rules which apply to ninety-nine cases out of a hundred." Not quite satisfied with this statement as to the arithmetical proportions of an attorney's knowledge of law, and of the cases in which he is called upon to exercise it, he then goes farther still, and affirms that far less than one per cent. of the cases which come before attorneys do not fall under these general rules. In the course of nearly thirty years of active business as an attorney in the City of London I have had occasion to learn many things, but I have yet to learn that there is an elysium for myself and my brethren—such as the writer of your article points to—in which, armed with certain broad general rules which anybody who knows any law at all can carry in his head, we may dispose of ninety-nine cases out of a hundred without specially directing our minds to the theory of the law. Taking the case of the Metropolis, and more particularly of its special centre of commercial enterprise, the City of London properly so called, I affirm without hesitation that the propositions of the writer of the article in question as to the compass of an attorney's acquirements, and of his need of using them, will not bear serious discussion. It is perfectly true that the attorney's knowledge of law in the abstract is not so precise as that of a member of the other branch of the profession; and for this most simple of all reasons—that the barrister is essentially and distinctly a specialist in the most exclusive sense of the word; whereas the attorney is called upon to acquire a knowledge of every branch of the law, a knowledge which for that reason is, as to each particular branch, almost necessarily more limited than that of the specialist in that branch. The client does not before consulting his attorney pause to consider whether he is specially versed in the principles of equity, of common law, of conveyancing, of bankruptcy, or of criminal law. He goes to him whenever he requires skilled legal assistance, and without reference to the nature of the case. But with the other branch of the profession all this is totally different. Each member of it is (with a very few exceptions) limited to all intents and purposes to one particular branch—nay, in the common parlance of the profession, it is usual to describe a member of the bar

as a common law counsel, an equity counsel, and so forth. Does it in the least follow from this state of circumstances, that, because the barrister is a specialist and the attorney is a generalist, the legal attainments of the latter, taken as a whole, are necessarily so meagre as the writer of your article would imply? I venture to say that it most assuredly does not—and further, that the direct contrary is the indisputable fact. In cases of gravity, and which allow of time for consideration, it is customary for the attorney to fortify himself with the assistance of the opinion of a barrister—and to derive from it very great and valuable assistance, too; but in countless cases the circumstances are such that the attorney is called upon almost at a moment's notice to apply his knowledge of law to an intricate state of facts, and to give his advice upon questions involving perhaps thousands of pounds, unaided, and with a legal responsibility from which the member of the more fortunate branch of his profession is absolutely exempt. And attorneys in large practice do this day after day, with no other assistance than their knowledge of the particular branch or branches of law called into requirement by the case, refreshed by reference to their libraries of text books and reports of cases, which in many instances are no whit inferior to those of members of the bar."

General Correspondence.

THE SCHOOL OF LAW BILL.

III.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The cumulative vote authorized by the 8th section appears extremely undesirable; it is calculated to facilitate the admission to the senate at every election of one or two solicitors whose claim to that honour may not be in accordance with the opinion of the general body of the electors, but may be espoused by a comparatively small clique of ardent and energetic admirers. Political influences do not determine the action of solicitors in professional matters; a machinery for the protection of minorities would therefore seem to be entirely out of place and superfluous, and could only operate to the deterioration of the representative element in the senate.

Passing from criticism of particular sections in the Bill, I will, with your leave, make a few general observations on the measure as a whole.

Prejudicial as the measure in its present form may be to the interests of solicitors, there is no ground whatever for supposing that it has been planned by Lord Selborne in a spirit of hostility to our branch of the profession. But Lord Selborne has his difficulties to contend with. This Bill is closely allied with the Inns of Court Bill; in truth, in a former session of Parliament, the objects of both Bills were sought to be obtained by a single Bill. If the School of Law Bill is carried, it is easy to foretell the passing of the Inns of Court Bill in the same or some early session, and the passing of that Bill will only be the prelude to future legislative changes which will be facilitated by this inroad upon the privileges and revenues of the Inns of Court. The attitude of the bar is therefore hostile to both these measures. To disarm opposition in Parliament Lord Selborne naturally desires to conciliate his formidable opponents, whose strength was proved, when he, as Sir Roundell Palmer, brought forward unsuccessfully his resolutions in the House of Commons. It is necessary to inspire the bar with confidence in his new measure, and to make its members believe that though the number of the students for the bar, and the income derived from their fees, will be largely exceeded by the number of, and fees derived from, articulated clerks, all real power will remain with them, and that they need not be apprehensive that the management of the school of law will pass into the hands of solicitors, who are chiefly interested in it. Hence the addition of sixteen *ex-officio* members to the senate, all of whom must, or may, be either present or former members of the bar, and therefore closely allied in sympathy and associations with the interests, feelings, and wishes of barristers.

The solicitors, expect, and have loudly claimed, equal power in the governing body. While the solicitors require equality with the bar on the governing body, the

bar will be satisfied with nothing less than a preponderance of influence. The representative element on either side is equal, but the influence of either may preponderate by means of the *ex-officio* members. Can any solicitor seriously doubt what will be the result whenever the pretensions of the bar or solicitors are brought into collision? Can anything be more certain than that in all class questions the influence of, and in favour of, the bar will prevail, and that the interests of solicitors will be sacrificed?

There is no occasion to suppose that the occupants of high places will be less scrupulous or conscientious in future than they have been heretofore, or the reverse. It may be instructive to forecast the future by the light of the past. We know that solicitors are equally eligible with barristers to fill the following posts under the various Acts of Parliament creating them:—(1) Solicitorship to the Treasury, Custom House, and other public offices; (2) Registrars in Bankruptcy, (3) Registrars in Probate Court, (4) Masters in the Common Law Courts, (5) Clerk of Enrolments in Chancery, and (6) Accountant-General in Chancery, while that office subsisted.

Is it not notorious that the great majority of these posts are habitually occupied by barristers, though most of them could be filled by solicitors with greater efficiency and advantage to the public?

Will the dispensers of the favour of the crown manifest greater consideration for solicitors under the School of Law Bill than under the statutes above referred to?

There can be but one answer to these questions.

The inference is irresistible that it is to the interest of solicitors that the education and examination of articulated clerks should be kept distinct from the education and examination of students for the bar. Let each branch of the profession manage its own concerns, and thus disappointment and mortification will be spared to solicitors, and jealousies and heartburnings on all sides will be avoided.

SOLICITOR.

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the weekly meeting of this society, held on Tuesday last at the Law Institution, there was a very fair attendance of members. Mr. Alexander M. Phillips was elected a member of the society. The question for discussion was No. 550 Legal—"Was the prisoner in the case of *Reg. v. Middleton* guilty of larceny?" The debate was opened by Mr. Todd in the affirmative, and continued by Mr. Cridge, Mr. F. G. Green, Mr. Rondell, and other gentlemen. The president (Mr. Indermaur) having summed up, the question was put to the society and carried in the affirmative by a majority of six votes.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Wednesday, the subject for the evening's debate being—"That solicitors should be permitted to conduct cases before the judges of the superior courts with or without the assistance of counsel." The motion was carried by a majority of one.

SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION.

MR. KETTLE ON IMPRISONMENT.

On Monday evening at the rooms of the Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Adam-street, Adelphi, Mr. Rupert Kettle, county court judge, read a paper on "Suggestions for diminishing the Number of Imprisonments." There was, he said, at present a general impression in the public mind that imprisonment as a punishment had been found insufficient to suppress crimes of violence, and, from the answers returned by petty sessions to the circular of the Home Secretary, there was a strong tendency of opinion in favour of again resorting to corporal punishment. It was expedient to inquire, before they discussed such changes as a return to flogging, why imprisonment had in modern times lost so much of its repressive force, and by what means that force could be

restored. The fear of bodily pain or of rigorous discipline was not the only means by which the dread of the gaol should be kept active in the minds of the lawless. To keep moral repugnance to imprisonment as active and sensitive as possible should be one of the primary objects of criminal law administration. This object was lost sight of when imprisonment was made so common that, either by experience or by close and frequent contemplation, the sentiments relating to it became incorporated with the ordinary daily ideas of the ignorant or the careless, so that by familiarity its wholesome terrors were lost. Men gradually became callous even to physical dangers with which they were in frequent and close contact. A national example of this deadening of the sense of shame by communion of degradation was seen under our old Poor Law, when in whole districts pauperism was willingly incorporated with the ordinary life of the English labourer. He was afraid there was a growing tendency among the ignorant and thoughtless of our population to regard imprisonment as one of the disagreeable contingencies affecting those who did not like regular work. A laxity of feeling as to the gaol arose when imprisonments were too numerous, and he contended that at present the excessive number of persons incarcerated weakened the external moral influence of that form of punishment. Another deterioration of the restraining influence of the gaol arose from inflicting imprisonment for trifling offences. For the gaol to have its full repellant power, the whole force of public opinion must go with its use, and that to such an extent that, in all cases where imprisonment was inflicted, no reasonable man should doubt that it was thoroughly deserved. What were the facts? While imprisonment for debt was abolished, they had, on the other hand, increased imprisonment in almost every direction. There was scarcely an act of misconduct or a breach of social order that was not at the present time directly or indirectly punishable by imprisonment. Statistics showed an indiscriminate use of imprisonment and an extensive use of the common gaol for other purposes than the punishment of what were properly called crimes. He was fully aware that any remedy for the evil of multitudinous imprisonments must be such as should not weaken the hand of the Executive; and he knew how difficult it would be to give to a new system any part of that which still remained, in traditional sentiment at least, of the repellant force of ancient punishment. Holding habitual criminals under police supervision had been so recently introduced, that it might still be regarded as an experiment. He thought that to fairly test the system its application should be extended to other than habitual criminals, accompanied, when so extended, by the additional safeguard of bail. Except as to this the remedial suggestions he should submit for discussion were all based upon the existing practice of our criminal law; and his proposition only extended the further use of known means to meet modern requirements. He would add that he saw the advantages which would result from such a revision of our criminal law as would separate by a clearer line than that used at present what were properly called crimes from mere acts of personal misconduct. The ancient division into felonies and misdemeanours did not classify with sufficient distinctness breaches of criminal law. He would treat of—1. Imprisonment for non-payment of fines and costs; 2. Imprisonment for first offences where securities for good behaviour could be procured; and, 3. Juvenile offenders. As to imprisonment for non-payment of a fine, stripped of all technical theories a fine properly imposed was a crown debt. If so, why not recover it as any other crown debt was recovered—by levy on the goods of the debtor? Give it priority over all other debts, rent included, and in all cases satisfy the judgment by levy if possible, and only when that failed from the fraud or misconduct of the judgment debtor, resort to imprisonment. To meet cases of non-payment of costs, let the payment of clerks of petty sessions by salary, instead of by fees, be made compulsory, dealing equitably with existing interests. The public officer would then be paid for the discharge of his duties out of public funds, and the treasury would be recouped by adding the costs to the fine debt. With regard to imprisonment for first offences, he suggested that, instead of sending adults to gaol upon a first conviction, the provisions of the Habi-

the Criminals Act should be extended. By this Statute the judge might, upon a conviction for felony, after a previous conviction for felony, in addition to any other sentence he might pass, order the convict to be kept, upon his release, under police supervision for any period not exceeding seven years. If no such order was made, then, by the provisions of the Statute, the convict was placed under supervision for the full term provided by the Statute. He saw no reason why such a practical mode of bringing compulsion to bear upon criminals, and thereby repressing crime, should be reserved until the propensity to commit crimes had become habitual. Police supervision left, in practice, a large latitude to the head of the local police as to the way in which supervision should be carried out. The object was to secure the public against depredation, and also to enforce upon the individual the duty of earning his maintenance by honest labour. Idle habits and bad companions would keep the police vigilant; on the other hand, regular work and a respectable home relaxed their watchfulness. Surveillance was, for the well conducted, reduced to requiring the person to report himself once a month, at a time when he could attend most conveniently and privately at the office. For those who continued their evil courses, the police did not wait for the public to suffer by the perpetration of positive crime, but they apprehended the convict under surveillance, and, unless he was able to prove that he was obtaining, or endeavouring to obtain, his living honestly, he was re-committed to gaol. A few words about "juvenile offenders." He never could believe that the common gaol was a proper place for children, although they went to school inside it. To the young, routine, however disagreeable at first, soon lost its irksomeness. If children were really benefited by a residence in gaol, it was from what they learnt and not from what they suffered. In nine cases out of ten it was the neglect of the parent which was the primary cause of the child's delinquency. Apply, therefore, proper and direct remedies to the cause. Use compulsion upon the negligent parent, but do not take the flogging from the nest and foster it as a "gaol bird." The efficacy of his proposed remedy in the case of naughty children was obvious. Let the parent first be induced by pecuniary guarantees to be more vigilant in the discharge of parental duty: if he refuse, as a last resource commit the little delinquent, not to the common gaol, but to an industrial training school, and rigorously enforce payment of the bare cost of the child's maintenance upon the neglectful parent. In conclusion, he submitted that by amending the criminal law in the manner proposed the number of imprisonments would be reduced; at the same time, he would increase greatly the relative severity of that punishment, and make it more effective as a means of repressing crime. A discussion followed, and a vote of thanks to Mr. Kettle and the chairman (Sir Walter Crofton, C.B.) terminated the proceedings.

Obituary.

MR. JOSEPH WATSON.

Mr. Joseph Watson, solicitor, of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, died suddenly at his residence at Gateshead on the 14th ult., in his 68th year. The deceased was born at Newcastle in 1807, and was educated at the Friends' School at Darlington, and afterwards at the University of London, where he twice gained the prize given by the late Prof. Amos in his law class. On the second occasion Mr. Watson had as competitor the present Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench in Ireland. Having been duly articulated to the late Mr. John Fenwick, of Newcastle, he was admitted a solicitor in 1830, and was in practice up to the day of his death. Mr. Watson was a very prominent member of the Society of Friends, and was very active in promoting social reforms and benevolent enterprises. He warmly interested himself on the Liberal side in the political contests of his time, especially in the Reform question in 1830-2, and in the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws. He was mainly instrumental in getting the principle of limited liability applied to banking companies. He was the author of several

works, both in prose and in verse, and for many years acted as honorary secretary to the Newcastle Literary and Scientific Institution. Mr. Watson's funeral was attended by a large number of his friends and fellow-townsmen. His son, Mr. Robert Spence Watson (admitted in 1860), has been associated in business with him.

MR. JOHN CRADDOCK.

Mr. John Craddock, who had practised as a solicitor in Warwickshire for about sixty years, died at Leamington on the 31st ult., at the age of ninety. Mr. Craddock was born in 1785, and was admitted a solicitor very early in the century. He practised for several years at Atherstone, after which he removed to Nuneaton, where he succeeded to the practice of his uncle, Mr. John Craddock. He continued in business in the latter town till 1853, when his increasing age compelled his retirement. During the latter part of his professional career he was associated in business with Mr. Edward Henry Shelley, by whom the practice is still conducted. Mr. Craddock was also for several years a member of a firm of bankers at Nuneaton. His politics were Conservative, and on several occasions he had the chief management for his party of the election contests in North Warwickshire. Mr. Craddock was twice married, first to the daughter of Mr. George Greenway, of Attleborough Hall, and secondly to the widow of the Rev. Edward Hughes. His funeral took place at Leamington on the 6th inst., and was largely attended by friends and neighbours from both Nuneaton and Leamington.

MR. RICHARD ALMACK.

Mr. Richard Almack, F.S.A., who practised for many years as a solicitor at Long Melford, Suffolk, died on New Year's-day, in his 76th year. The deceased was the eldest son of the late Mr. Thomas Almack, of Bishop Barton, Yorkshire, by Catherine, daughter of the late Richard Baragh, Esq. He was born in 1799, and admitted a solicitor in 1824, and had been a resident in Melford for half a century. He held for many years the offices of clerk to the county magistrates at Melford, and clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes for the Hundred of Babergh. On the passing of the first County Court Act, he was made clerk of county courts for the whole of Circuit No. 38, comprising nearly all Essex and a part of Suffolk, and he appointed deputies in each town; but when a different arrangement was made, he became Registrar of the Sudbury Court only, an office which he resigned some time ago. He was a commissioner for taking affidavits both at chancery and common law, and also a perpetual commissioner for taking acknowledgments of deeds by married women. On his retirement from practice, a few years ago, he was made magistrate for Suffolk, and was thenceforth very regular in his attendance on the Melford bench, where his professional knowledge and experience made his services most valuable. Mr. Almack was very fond of archaeology, and his antiquarian knowledge was extensive. He was elected in 1831 a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and he was also an honorary member of the Massachusetts Philosophical Society and of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Mr. Almack was married to the only daughter of Lieut.-Col. Frederick James Horn, and sister of Lieut.-Gen. Sir Frederick Horn, K.C.B.

MR. THOMAS WARD BLAGG.

The death of Mr. Thomas Ward Blagg, of Victoria-street and St. Alban's, occurred on the 31st of December last. Mr. Blagg was born in 1801, and was admitted a solicitor in 1827. Immediately on his admission he settled at St. Alban's, and was shortly afterwards appointed town clerk, and clerk to the borough magistrates, as well as clerk to the magistrates for the Watford division. He held all these offices up to the time of his death. In 1868 he succeeded the late Mr. Simpson as Registrar of the St. Alban's County Court. Mr. Blagg was a prominent member of the local Conservative party, and took a very active part in all the borough elections up to the time of the disfranchisement of St. Alban's. About four years ago he was appointed, with his partner,

Mr. Edwards, to the joint secretaryship of the Herts Conservative Association, and the contest at the recent election for that county was conducted under his direction. He was one of the founders of the Municipal Officers' Society, and held the post of secretary from its formation. In matters of local interest he was very active, and few men were better known in his division of the county of Herts. Some forty years ago, when the defalcations of an official of a local savings bank had caused a heavy loss, the whole amount of the deficit was raised through Mr. Blagg's unceasing energy, and the depositors were paid in full. A handsome testimonial was presented to him in acknowledgment of his exertions. Mr. Blagg's genial and humorous turn rendered him widely popular. His fund of anecdote, derived from the varied incidents of his long and, in some respects, remarkable career, was almost inexhaustible. His bodily and mental activity continued with little abatement until a few months before his death. During last summer, however, he showed symptoms of impaired health, and decided upon spending the autumn at Hastings. The change appeared to have a beneficial effect, and about a month ago he removed to Norwood. He was at church on Christmas-day, apparently in his wonted health and spirits, but he died on the last day of the year. His remains were taken to St. Alban's for interment, and the funeral was attended by a large circle of friends and neighbours. Mr. Blagg was married to Miss Cotterill, daughter of the late Rev. Joseph Cotterill, Honorary Canon of Norwich, and sister of the present Bishop of Grahamstown.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. GEORGE SMITH, solicitor, of Salisbury, has been elected to the Coronership of that city, vacant by the resignation of Dr. Edward Young. Mr. Smith was admitted in 1849, and is treasurer to the corporation. He is in partnership with Mr. Henry William Cobb, the clerk to the county justices for the Salisbury and Amesbury divisions.

Mr. WILLIAM ELLERKER HART, barrister-at-law, has been appointed Clerk and Sealer to the Insolvent Debtors Court at Bombay. Mr. Hart was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Easter Term, 1871.

The Hon. Sir REDMOND BARRY, judge of the Supreme Court of Victoria, has been appointed to administer the Government of the colony during the absence in England, of the Governor, Sir George Ferguson Bowen. Sir R. Barry is the third son of the late Major-General Henry Green Barry, of Barryclough, Cork, and was born in 1813. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and was called to the Irish bar in 1838. He was appointed Solicitor-General of Victoria in 1850, and a judge of the Supreme Court in 1851. He was knighted in 1860, and he has been Chancellor of the University of Melbourne.

Mr. ROBERT PRYOR, barrister-at-law, of High Elms, Watford, has been elected Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the St. Alban's division of Hertfordshire. Mr. Pryor is the son of the late Mr. Thomas Marlborough Pryor, of Hampstead, and was born in 1812. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was fourth wrangler in 1834, and graduated as M.A. in 1837. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1837, and was for several years an equity draughtsman and conveyancer. Mr. Pryor is a magistrate for Hertfordshire, and was high-sheriff in 1868. About seven years ago he succeeded the Earl of Verulam as chairman of quarter sessions for the Liberty of St. Alban's, which jurisdiction was extinguished by an Act passed last session.

Mr. GEORGE ROBERT MARTEN, of Marshall's Wick, St. Alban's, has been elected Deputy-Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the St. Alban's division of Hertfordshire.

Mr. JOHN WILLIAMS RANDALL, solicitor, 10, King's-bench-walk, Temple, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery.

A taxing-mastership in the Court of Chancery has become vacant by the death (at the age of seventy) of Mr. John James Johnson, who had held the office about four years. He was admitted a solicitor in 1832, and was formerly a member of the firm of Johnson & Master, of Southampton-buildings, and he was for several years solicitor to the Suitors' Fee Fund of the Court of Chancery.

The vestry clerkship of Christ Church, Streatham, has become vacant by the death of Mr. Charles Thomas Jenkinson, of the firm of Jenkinson, Owen, & Olivers, of 1, Corbett-court, Gracechurch-street. Mr. Jenkinson was admitted a solicitor in 1833.

The registrarship of the St. Alban's County Court (Circuit No. 37) has become vacant by the death of Mr. Thomas Ward Blagg.

Legal Items.

The *Athenaeum* states that the Right Hon. Sir John Byles is engaged upon a volume called "Foundations of Religion in the Mind and Heart of Man."

Mr. E. J. Wilson, the secretary of the Estate Exchange, Tokenhouse-yard, has published the following return of land and other property registered as sold by public auction and by private contract for the year 1874, as compared with the two preceding years, viz: 1872, £9,901,220; 1873, £8,948,362; 1874, £11,160,324.

At the Cambridgeshire Quarter Sessions the jury having returned a verdict of not guilty in the case of a man charged with killing a rabbit in ground used for the purpose of breeding rabbits, the chairman (Mr. Edward Hicks) said he should decline to take the verdict unless the jury gave their reasons for the conclusion which they had arrived at. Mr. Naylor, the prisoner's counsel, protested against this course, and after some discussion the verdict was entered and the prisoner discharged.

The Quarter Sessions for the borough of Bideford were held on Saturday last before the recorder, Mr. Charles Jerome March. There was only one prisoner for trial, and the grand jury, having been duly charged, retired to their room. Much surprise was caused by their absence for an hour and a quarter, when they returned into court and stated that they found the prisoner guilty. Much laughter was occasioned by this statement, and the recorder complained that they had wasted a large amount of the public time by doing what he had expressly told them not to do. The prisoner was then put on his trial and acquitted.

The first law school in the United States of any note, says the *Forum*, was founded at Litchfield, Ct., by Dr. Bellamy, about twenty-five years before the revolutionary war. The law school at Litchfield owed its origin to Tappan Reeve, a native of Long Island, a graduate at Nassau Hill, a son-in-law of President Burr, and so a brother-in-law of Aaron Burr, vice-president of the United States, and was begun just after the revolution was over. Some time afterwards Judge Reeve formed a co-partnership with James Gould, a lawyer in Litchfield, and a graduate of Yale College, who became the head of the school in 1820, on the retirement of Judge Reeve, and afterwards associated himself with Jabez W. Huntington, afterwards senator of the United States, and Judge of the Supreme Court of Connecticut. Down to 1833, about five years before the death of Judge Gould, there had been educated at Litchfield 1,024 lawyers from all parts of the United States, of whom 183 were from the Southern States. In this number are included fifteen United States senators, five cabinet officers in the general Government, ten governors of States, fifty members of Congress, forty judges of the highest State courts, and two judges of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Thomas A. Brierley, assistant secretary of the Northern Counties Coroners' Committee, writes on behalf of that committee, to a Manchester journal, on the question, which appears to have been recently discussed in that city, whether the coroner has, in any case duly reported to him, the discretion of either holding or not holding the inquest. Mr.

Brierley says: "Formerly, when county coroners were paid by fees, the law as settled by the courts was, that though the coroner was bound to hold the inquest, the quarter sessions had the discretion of disallowing the fee. The judges repeatedly said that this was a great injustice to the coroner, and required correction by the Legislature. Accordingly salaries were substituted for fees; and, expressly to take away from the quarter sessions any control, power of interference, or discretion whatever, the salary was calculated on 'inquests held,' leaving out the words 'duly taken,' which had been held to give the quarter sessions the right to interfere. Mr. Ashworth's statement, therefore, that the Act of Parliament gave the sessions the power of controlling the coroner, and that it rested with the court to say whether an inquest was unnecessarily held, seems to be wholly without foundation in law; though it is presumed there is nothing to prevent the sessions from passing an opinion upon the exercise by a coroner, a recorder, or even an archdeacon of any part of his official functions. Mr. Ashworth further stated that the Act of Parliament provided that in case the coroner required further information prior to issuing his precept for inquiry he might visit the place himself and see whether it was necessary to hold an inquiry, the expenses of the journey being paid. This also seems to be a mistake, and is based upon an extrajudicial dictum of Lord Denman's, that if a coroner on holding an inquest finds that there was no cause for it he may stop and not conclude the inquest. This, however, has never been subsequently approved by the courts, and is evidently opposed to the whole principles of the office."

Courts.

BANKRUPTCY.*

(Before the Hon. W. C. SPRING-RICE, sitting as Chief Judge.)

Dec. 12.—*Re Sir Wm. Russell.*

A debtor filed a petition under the 125th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, and a trustee was appointed, and a resolution passed and registered for liquidation by arrangement. Afterwards the debtor entered into a covenant with the trustee to pay the respective sums of £4,000 and £5,000, for the benefit of his creditors, by instalments, and the creditors granted the debtor his discharge, subject to these payments being made. The debtor paid £6,000 on account to the trustee, but he was unable to make any further payment, and the liquidation had never been closed. He resumed business with the knowledge of the trustee, and having incurred fresh debts he filed a second petition.

The creditors under the second petition passed resolutions for (1.) liquidation by arrangement, and (2) the appointment of a trustee, and (3) that until full payment of all the debts provable under the liquidation the debtor should pay to the trustee by equal half-yearly payments (commencing at six months from the date of such registration) such portion of his income as should exceed £600 per year, and (4) for the discharge of the debtor subject to these payments being made.

Upon an application being made to register the resolutions, Held, that as all the debtor's assets passed to the trustee under the first petition, the second petition ought not to have been presented, and no resolutions under it ought to be registered.

Held, also, that the creditors under the first petition had no right of proof under the second, and that the 3rd and 4th resolutions were *ultra vires*.

This was an application to register resolutions passed pursuant to the 125th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, under a second petition for liquidation presented by Sir William Russell.

The following is an abstract of the resolutions:—

- (1.) Liquidation by arrangement and not in bankruptcy.
- (2.) The appointment of a trustee.
- (3.) A proviso that until full payment of all the debts provable under the liquidation the debtor should pay to the trustee by equal half-yearly payments (commencing at six months from the date of such registration) such portion of his income as should exceed £600 per annum.
- (4.) A proviso that as soon as a deed to embody the terms of the resolutions should be executed by the debtor he should be discharged, without any further resolution of

creditors from all debts provable under the liquidation, such discharge to be null and void in case of failure by the debtor to perform the covenants contained in the deed, such failure being certified by the trustee.

(5) The reservation of the rights of creditors against sureties or third persons in respect of securities held for their debts.

(6) Messrs. Lewis, Munns, & Co. to register the resolutions.

Objection was taken to the registration of the resolutions on behalf of A. Laurie, a creditor, and Colonel Crauford Frazer, on the ground that the resolutions were unreasonable and inequitable, and not such as ought to be registered, and that, in substance, the debtor had no assets.

It appeared that the debtor, who traded as a shipowner and merchant in Salters' Hall court, had under a former petition, filed about four years since (and under which liquidation by arrangement was resolved upon), entered into a covenant with the trustee to pay the respective sums of £4,000 and £5,000 for the benefit of his creditors by instalments, and the creditors granted the debtor his discharge subject to the payments being made. The debtor paid sums of money amounting to £6,000 to the trustee but he was unable to make any further payment.

The debtor, upon examination, stated that, after the former petition, he resumed trade, with the knowledge of Mr. Kemp, the trustee, and incurred fresh debts. A second petition followed. The first liquidation had never been closed.

Munns, solicitor, for the debtor, in support of the application to register the resolutions.

Harvie Linklater, solicitor, for Mr. Laurie, a creditor, *contra*.

Jewell, for Colonel Crauford Frazer, another creditor.

The course of the arguments sufficiently appears from the judgment of the court.

Cur. adv. vult.

Mr. Registrar SPRING-RICE, after stating the effect of the resolutions, said:—Under the notice, I held that it was competent for Mr. Linklater to allege that inasmuch as the debtor had filed a previous liquidation petition, the proceedings under which were still pending, all his assets passed to the trustee under the first petition, under the 3rd sub-section of the 15th section of the Act. In reply to this objection, it was first argued that it was premature to investigate the question of assets at the hearing of the application to register the resolutions. No such question could arise on an adjudication on a second petition in bankruptcy; and the analogy between a bankruptcy petition and a petition for liquidation in this respect was complete. I do not concur in this view. I think the decision in *Re Ash* (16 S. J. 574) has rendered it proper that the inquiry whether there are assets to be administered should be raised at this time. I admit that it may be difficult to go into the question where there is an avowment of such assets by the debtor; yet such avowment must not, on the face of the proceedings, be open to challenge, and this I think is the case here, where *prima facie* such assets as the debtor had would pass to the trustee under the first liquidation, unless by the conduct of such trustee he had forfeited his right to them. Before going into the question whether there has been such conduct in this case, I must say that I do not accede to Mr. Munns' argument that sub-section 9, section 125, by which it is enacted that the provisions as to the close of a bankruptcy and the discharge of a bankrupt shall not apply to a liquidating debtor, renders inapplicable sub-section 3 of section 15, with regard to the property which is to devolve upon the trustee during the continuance of the liquidation proceedings. It is to my mind clear from the Act that the law on this point in regard to a debtor adjudicated bankrupt, or whose estate is in liquidation, the proceedings being still pending, is precisely the same. Mr. Munns also argued that the effect of the resolutions under the first liquidation was to entitle the debtor to his order of discharge. Without giving an opinion whether this be so or not, it is clear that the order of discharge does not bar the right of the trustee to the property devolving on the debtor. It is the close of the proceedings alone which has this effect. There is no question that the proceedings in the first liquidation are still pending.

* Reported by J. C. BROUGH, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

I come now to the question whether the conduct of the trustee in regard to the debtor and his estate has been such as to disentitle him to the property as against the new creditors. I have had much more difficulty on this point of the argument, and it is not without hesitation that, on the evidence of the debtor, I have come to the conclusion that it does not show connivance by the trustee at his trading nor such neglect or *laches* on his part as can be held to create a new liability in respect of the new debts. According to my view, therefore, all the assets set forth by the debtor in his second liquidation petition belong to the trustee under the first petition, and there being no assets to administer under the second petition it ought not to have been presented, and no resolutions under it ought to be registered.

As it may be intended to take the opinion of a higher tribunal in regard to this point, I thought it well to hear arguments in respect to the other objections that have been raised to the registration of these resolutions, in order that the parties may have my opinion on these also, and so be able to bring the whole matter, if they so desire, before the Court of Appeal. The first objection raised was that no creditor under the first liquidation could by virtue of a renewal of his old debt be allowed to vote on the resolutions under the second. Now, I believe it to be admitted that none of such creditors did vote on the resolutions actually passed, and, if this were disputed, I should require, before dealing with their votes, a report from Mr. Penn on this point, for I am clearly of opinion that the votes of no such creditors should be allowed. It was argued that as the Act of 1869 contains no section similar to the 164th section of the Act of 1861, avoiding contracts made by bankrupts after adjudication, such contracts must be considered as legal and binding under the Act of 1869. But I should have hesitated much to come to such a conclusion—the effect of which would be to enable old creditors with renewed debts to come in competition with new creditors whose debts were provable only under a second fiat or liquidation as the case might be. But a decision of the Chief Judge, which is, of course, binding upon me until reversed on appeal (*Jones v. Phelps*, 20 W. R. 92), covers the point. His lordship there held that when a debtor was discharged from a debt by bankruptcy a promise by him to pay it was a mere *nudum pactum*, and would not, therefore, sustain an action. The case of *Marshall v. King* (23 W. R. 92), referred to by Mr. Munns, seems to me no authority the other way. According to the statement of that case, it arose in respect of a bill given by a bankrupt in regard to work done under a contract, doubtless entered into before, but partly executed subsequent to, the adjudication. But though I think it is admitted that none of the creditors under the first liquidation have voted under the second liquidation in regard to the resolutions actually passed, yet I find that one creditor, who the bankrupt swears is an old creditor—namely, the University Life Office—voted on the motion for the adjournment; but if this vote be, as it must be, disallowed, unless there are other creditors in the same category there still remains a majority in favour of the adjournment. I think the objection to the vote of the trustee under the first liquidation, on the ground that his giving the vote required the sanction of the Committee of Inspection under the 2nd sub-section of section 27, would be a valid one if the resolutions passed under the petition were to accept a composition, but, in such a case, I should be unwilling to exclude his vote without evidence as to whether he had or had not received the required sanction. I think the deed on which Mr. Munns relied as giving him authority to take proceedings in bankruptcy by himself does not authorize a vote given in favour of a resolution to accept a composition.

This brings me lastly to consider the form of the resolutions themselves, and I think they are not such as ought to be registered—with the exception of the 1st and 2nd. The 3rd is substantially a resolution to accept a composition, requiring the confirmation of a second meeting under section 126, with an addition to it leaving the debtor in possession of property. This resolution, as well as resolution 4, under which the debtor was to receive his order of discharge, in my opinion were *ultra vires* the creditors at this meeting, and could only be passed at a meeting specially called for the purpose. There is authority for disregarding such portions of the resolutions as were *ultra vires*, and registering the remainder, but as in my opinion these proceedings have failed in the other respects which I have indicated, I shall decline to register any part of the resolutions.

Law Students' Journal.

EXAMINATIONS AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

Michaelmas Term, 1874.

FINAL EXAMINATION.

At the Examination of Candidates for Admission on the Roll of Attorneys and Solicitors of the Superior Courts, the examiners recommended the following gentlemen, under the age of twenty-six, as being entitled to honorary distinction:—

Alfred Wallis, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Richard and William Stott, of Rochdale.

Roger Eustace Perry, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Cooper and Norgate, of East Dereham, and Messrs. Milne, Riddle, and Mellor, of London.

Joseph Brough, who served his clerkship to Mr. Joseph Knight, of Newcastle-under-Lyme, and Messrs. G. L. P. Eyre and Co., of London.

John Hands, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Lawrance, Plews, Boyer, and Baker, of London.

The Council of the Incorporated Law Society have accordingly awarded the following prizes of books:—

To Mr. Wallis, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clifford's Inn.

To Mr. Perry, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clement's Inn.

To Mr. Brough and Mr. Hands, prizes of the Incorporated Law Society.

The examiners have also certified that the following candidates, under the age of twenty-six, whose names are placed in alphabetical order, passed examinations which entitle them to commendation:—

Francis Henry Bruges, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Clark and Collins, of Trowbridge, and Messrs. Whitakers and Woolbert, of London.

Percy Holmes, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Hughes and King, of Maidstone, and Messrs. Hughes, Hooker, and Buttanshaw, of London.

Edwin Feed James, who served his clerkship to Mr. George Septimus Warrington, of London.

John Edward Lees, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Lingard and Co., of Manchester and London.

Reginald Carter Nelson, who served his clerkship to Mr. John William Danby, of Lincoln, and Messrs. Paterson, Snow, and Burney, of London.

George Henry Norris, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Norris and Wood, of Manchester.

Edward Shaw, who served his clerkship to Mr. Thomas Blanchard Burland, of South Cave, Yorkshire, and Messrs. Lambert and Petch, of London.

George Henry Woolley, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Woolley and Beardsley, of Loughborough, and Messrs. Williamson, Hill, and Co., of London.

The Council have accordingly awarded them certificates of merit.

The examiners have further announced to the following candidates that their answers to the questions at the examination were highly satisfactory, and would have entitled them to prizes if they had not been above the age of twenty-six:—

John Vernon.

George William Haines.

The number of candidates examined in this term was 170; of these, 139 passed, and 31 were postponed.

FINAL EXAMINATION.

NAMES OF GENTLEMEN WHO PASSED THE FINAL EXAMINATION IN MICHAELMAS TERM, 1874.

Abbot, Hy. Napier, B.A.	Blair, Robert.
Aylesbury, Harry.	Brett, Arthur.
Badger, Henry Walter.	Bridford, John Herbert.
Barker, Alfred.	Brough, Josh.
Barrow, Thos. Metcalfe.	Bruges, Fras. Hy.
Bayley, Fewster Johnson.	Burchell, Jas. Ward.
Bickley, Edward.	Buttie, William.
Birchall, Charles Francis	Candler, Saml. Horace.
Bullard.	Carey, Josh. Williamson.

Carr, Jas.
 Chapman, Robt.
 Clark, Hy. Hollier.
 Copeland, Thos. Wm.
 Cottrell, Wm. Lumfen.
 Cox, Chas. Markham.
 Crowther, Fras. Richd.
 Denison, Josh.
 Dill, Marcus Gordon Col-
 quhoun.
 Dobson, Henry.
 Earl, Robt. Campbell.
 Ellborough, Chas. Marryat.
 Ellis, Hercules Arthur.
 Ellis, John.
 Evans, Peter Mwyndey.
 Fennell, Wm. Edwd.
 Flood, Arthur Edwd.
 Foreman, Geo. Ullathorne.
 Fowler, R. H.
 Fry, John.
 Garsed, John Law.
 Goate, Wm. Ranley.
 Goodwin, Fredk. Sidney.
 Haines, Geo. Wm.
 Halse, Clarence Rd.
 Hampson, Robert Alfd.
 Hands, Jno.
 Hayes, Arthur Geo.
 Hewitt, Thos.
 Hobbs, Chas. Thos.
 Hobson, Ernest Edwd.
 Holmes, Percy.
 Howard, William, Jr.
 Hoyland, Chas. Hugh.
 Hoyle, Geo. Hardman.
 Hunt, Thos. Henry Catero,
 B.A.
 Hutchins, Arthur Brick-
 wood.
 Jackson, Frank Stather.
 James, Edward Peed.
 Janion, Herbt. Garnett.
 Jenkinson, John, Jr.
 Jennings, Geo. Wm.
 Johnson, Wm. Thos.
 Kimbley, Miles Jefferson.
 King, Josh. Edmd. Shep-
 pard.
 Knowles, John.
 Lamb, Richd. Moor.
 Langley, Wm. Chas.
 Last, Fredk. Jr.
 Lawes, Edwd. Bowen.
 Lea, John Henry.
 Lees, John Edward.
 Leigh, Enoch Taylor.
 Little, Fredk. Arthur.
 Locke, Wm. Jas.
 Lomer, Walter Randall.
 Longson, Josh.
 Lukey, Ernest.
 Malkin, Hy.
 Martin, John Wesley.

Melhuish, John.
 Mills, Hy.
 Molesworth, Alex.
 Moore, Geo. Travers.
 Nelson, Reginald Carter.
 New, Herbert, Jr.
 Nicholls, John.
 Norman, George Boulter
 Bathurst.
 Norris, Geo. Hy.
 Norris, Hy. Josh.
 North, Harold Jas.
 Oliver, Wm. Hy.
 Paynter, Jas. Bernard.
 Pearce, Alfred Wm.
 Peckham, Arthur Wellesley.
 Perry, Roger Eustace.
 Phillips, Chas. Arthur.
 Pope, Horace Kelway.
 Powell, Jas. Leslie Grove.
 Raine, William.
 Randall, Wm. Richard, B.A.
 Randa, Geo. William.
 Robson, Wm. Snowdon.
 Roffe, Chas. Marceloff.
 Rodgers, John Jarvis.
 Rothera, Chas. Lambert.
 Sellick, Geo. Hy.
 Shaw, Edward.
 Shepherd, Regd. Arthur.
 Smith, Benjamin.
 Smith, John Edward.
 Smith, Theodore John.
 Spiller, Fredk. Hutchinson.
 Stanbury, Fras. Richard.
 Stones, George William.
 Stronghill, Chas. Reginald.
 Stuart, Robert.
 Symonds, Henry.
 Taylor, Chas. Richd., M.A.
 Taylor, Fredk. Herbert.
 Taylor, Geo. Edwd. Moore.
 Temple, Henry Fras.
 Thomas, John Aaron.
 Toppin, Sidney.
 Trenchard, Hy. Montague.
 Vaisey, Arthur William.
 Vanderpump, Paul Edwd.
 Vaughan, George.
 Vernon, John.
 Wallis, Alfred.
 Webb, William.
 Whitehead, John.
 Whitfield, John.
 Whittle, Frederick.
 Wiggins, Samuel.
 Wigston, William Jebb.
 Wilkin, Robert Alfred.
 Wilson, James.
 Wilson, James Edward.
 Woolley, Geo. Henry.
 Wright, Frederic Robert.
 Yates, Hercules Campbell.

Wellington Langdon, William Harry Barber Lindsell,
 John Allen Mylrea, Emilius St. Clair O'Malley, Alfred
 Edmund Packe, Henry Frederick Plunkett, Harry Inglis
 Richmond, Charles Henry Witts Woodroffe, of Lincoln's-inn;
 and John Foster Reed, of Gray's-inn, Esqs., certificates that
 they have satisfactorily passed a public examination.

General Examination of Students of the Inns of Court
 held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, and
 6th of January, 1875.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to Edward
 Cuming, of the Middle Temple, and Walter Ross Phillips,
 of the Inner Temple, Esqs., studentships in jurisprudence
 and Roman civil law, of one hundred guineas, to continue
 for a period of two years; David Jones Brynmor, and
 Arthur Hewett Spokes, of the Middle Temple, Esqs.,
 studentships in jurisprudence and Roman civil law, of one
 hundred guineas, for one year.

Court Papers.

CHANCERY FUNDS CONSOLIDATED RULES, 1874.

UNDER THE COURT OF CHANCERY (FUNDS) ACT, 1872,
 35 & 36 VICT. c. 44.

Issued the 22nd day of December, 1874.

I, the Right Honourable Hugh Mac Calmont, Baron
 Cairns, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, with the con-
 currence of the Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury, do
 hereby, in pursuance of the powers contained in the "Court
 of Chancery (Funds) Act, 1872," and of every other power
 enabling me in that behalf, make the following rules:—

I.—*Operation and Construction of Rules.—Definitions.—*

Revocation of former Rules and General Orders.

1. The Chancery Funds Rules, 1872, except the first of the
 said rules, are hereby revoked, and these Consolidated Rules
 are substituted in lieu thereof, and shall come into operation
 on the 11th day of January, 1875; and they shall be filed in
 the Report Office of the High Court of Chancery, and may be
 cited as the "Chancery Funds Consolidated Rules, 1874."

2. In these rules, and in orders as herein prescribed and
 defined, and in directions and certificates issued by the
 Chancery Paymaster, terms shall have the same meaning as
 the same terms are defined to have in the said Act, and the
 term "court" shall mean the Court of Chancery; and the
 term "order" shall mean an order of the Court of Chancery,
 intitled in a cause or matter in the said court, and made by
 any judge or judges thereof whether sitting in court or at
 chambers, or an order of the court intitled in the matter of
 the suitors of the court; or as to payments out of the "Appeal
 Deposit Account" an order made on a non-attendable petition
 presented to the Lord Chancellor; and the term "order"
 shall include a decree, and a report of a Master in Lunacy
 confirmed by fiat, and thereby receiving the operation of an
 order under the Lunacy Regulation Act, 1853, 16 & 17 Vict.
 c. 70; and the term "chief clerk" shall mean the chief
 clerk of a judge of the said court; and the terms "chief
 clerk's certificate" and "certificate of a chief clerk" shall
 mean a certificate intitled in a cause or matter in the said
 court, and made up by a chief clerk of a judge of the said
 court, and approved and signed by a judge thereof; and the
 term "bank" shall mean Bank of England or Governor and
 Company of the Bank of England; and the term "National
 Debt Commissioners" shall mean the Commissioners for the
 Reduction of the National Debt; and the term "Chancery
 Paymaster" shall mean her Majesty's Paymaster General for
 the time being, or the Assistant Paymaster General for
 Chancery business for the time being deputed by the Pay-
 master General to act on his behalf for Chancery business;
 and the term "Chancery Pay Office" shall mean Paymaster
 General's office for Chancery business; and the term "Chan-
 cery Pay Office account" shall mean the account at the bank
 of the Paymaster General for the time being on behalf of the
 Court of Chancery; and the term "Chancery Audit Office"
 shall mean the Chancery branch of the Department of the
 Comptroller and Auditor General; and words importing the
 singular number shall include the plural number, and words
 importing the plural number shall include the singular
 number, and words importing males shall include females.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

HILARY EXAMINATION, 1875.

General Examination of Students of the Inns of Court,
 held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, and
 6th of January, 1875.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to John
 Consumaker Anderson, Llewellyn Archer Athertley-Jones,
 Horace Edmund Avory, William Baker, Henry Dawes
 Bonsey, Henry Cooke, James Herbert Fellowes, William
 Blake Johnson, Robert Gray Cornish Mowbray, of the
 Inner Temple; James Henry Deakin, Arthur Beecher
 Elliott, Athelstane Braxton Hicks, Edward Legge, Pramatha
 Natha Mitra, Ebenezer Nash, Henry Priestley, of the Middle
 Temple; Ponnambalam Arunásalam, William Henry Dyer,
 John Alderson Foote, Leigh Hoskyns, George Frederick

In these rules the "title of the cause" shall, with respect to causes commenced since 1st November, 1852, mean the short title of the cause with the reference to the record as prescribed by the 48th rule of the first of the Consolidated Orders of the Court, in the following form, viz., (A. v. B. 1874. A. 100); and the term "cause or matter" shall include a separate account in a cause or matter, and a matter intitled merely as an account.—(Original rule 2 amended.)

3. The following rules of the Consolidated Orders of the Court, General Orders of the Court, and General Orders in Lunacy are hereby abrogated, viz.:—The 1st to the 16th rules, both inclusive, of the 1st of the said Consolidated Orders; the 5th rule of the 5th of the said Consolidated Orders; the 3rd to the 9th rules, both inclusive, of the 23rd of the said Consolidated Orders; the 1st to the 9th rules, both inclusive, of the 41st of the said Consolidated Orders; the General Orders of 10th January, 1870, as to legacy and succession duty, the General Orders of 25th February, 1868, 17th January, 1870, 1st May, 1871, and 28th August, 1828; and the 29th, 49th, 50th, and 51st of the General Orders in Lunacy of 7th November, 1853.—(Original rule 3 amended.)

4. Every rule or part of a rule hereinafter contained which is a repetition without variation of a rule, or general order, or part of a rule or general order, hereby revoked or abrogated, shall receive the same construction as was put on such revoked or abrogated rule or order, or part of a rule or of an order, and shall operate, not as a new rule, but in the same manner as such revoked or abrogated rule or order, or part of a rule or of an order, would have operated if this consolidation had not been effected.—(See Prel. Cons. Order, rule 7.)

5. Every rule or part of a rule hereinafter contained which is a repetition with variation of a rule, or general order, or part of a rule or general order, hereby revoked or abrogated, shall receive the same construction as was put on such revoked or abrogated rule or order, or part of a rule or of an order, and shall operate, not as a new rule, but in the same manner as such revoked or abrogated rule or order, or part of a rule or of an order, would have operated if this consolidation had not been effected, except so far as such variation indicates a contrary intention. And where the variation is of such a character as to be reasonably attributable, not to a variation of intention, but simply to a design to harmonize the style or language of the several rules and general orders hereinafter incorporated, such variation shall not be deemed to indicate any such contrary intention.—(See Prel. Cons. Order, rule 8.)

6. Orders made before the commencement of the Chancery Funds Rules, 1872, containing directions not then carried into effect, for the payment of money into, or deposit of securities in, the bank with the privy of the Accountant-General to the credit of a cause or matter, or for the transfer of securities into the name and with the privy of the Accountant-General in trust in a cause or matter, shall be read and construed as if they directed such money or securities respectively to be paid or transferred into, or deposited in court to the credit of the same cause or matter, and no declaration of trust shall be required to be made with respect to any of such securities.—(Original rule 4 amended.)

II.—Framing and Printing Orders, and Particulars to be stated.—Duplicates, and Office Copies.

7. Every order directing money or securities in court to be dealt with shall, except in the case of orders made in the matter of the suitors of the court, be intitled in the cause or matter (but not in any separate account therein), to the credit of which such money or securities shall be placed in the books at the Chancery Pay Office; and every such order shall state, in the body of such order and not merely by reference to the title of it, the exact title of the cause or matter and separate account, if any, to the credit of which the money or securities dealt with shall be standing; and every order directing money or securities to be brought into court shall state in the body of such order the title of the cause or matter, and the separate account, if any, to the credit of which such money or securities are to be placed.—(Original rule 5.)

8. Every order directing money or securities in court to be dealt with shall express the exact amount of money or securities to be dealt with, whenever it can be ascertained, and the amount of money or securities standing in the books at the Chancery Pay Office, at the date of such order, to the credit of the cause or matter to which the money or securities to be dealt with may be placed, and not merely by reference to another order (except where the name of one person is

ordered to be substituted for the name of another person to whom a payment, transfer, or delivery of money or securities, has been directed by a former order); and if the money or securities, or the dividends on securities, to be so dealt with under any such order, shall not be in court at the date thereof, the source from which such money, securities, or dividends will be derived shall be stated.

And in every case the exact amount of money or securities in court to be dealt with by the Chancery Paymaster shall be expressed in an order, or in a chief clerk's certificate, or in a certificate of a taxing master, or in a certificate of a Master in Lunacy; unless such money be payable for legacy or succession duty, or be described as dividends to accrue on securities in court, or to be brought into court, or as interest to be credited in respect of money on deposit, or as money to arise by the realization of securities, or as the residue of such dividends, interest, money, or securities respectively, after deducting an amount expressed in an order or in such a certificate, or an amount of securities directed to be realized unascertained at the date of the order directing the realization thereof, or as an aliquot or proportionate part of such dividends, interest, money, securities, or residue, respectively; and in the case of residues, and aliquot or proportionate parts, of moneys, securities, dividends, or interests, the amount of which cannot be ascertained at the date of the order, the amounts may be ascertained in manner provided by rules 10 and 86.

Money, dividends, or interest directed by an order to be paid into court, the amount of which cannot be ascertained at the date of the order, may be ascertained in like manner.—(Original rule 6 amended.)

9. Directions in orders to be acted upon by the Chancery Paymaster shall, so far as practicable, be expressed in or by reference to a schedule or tabular statement subjoined to the order; and where the actual amounts to be dealt with cannot be ascertained at the date of the order, the aliquot or proportionate parts to be dealt with may be stated in such schedule or tabular statement in words at length, but the total amount of the securities or money, or where the order does not dispose of the whole then the number of the aliquot or proportionate parts dealt with in any such schedule shall be stated in words at length in the mandatory part of the order.—(Part of original rule 7 amended.)

10. When interest is payable in respect of any money in court directed by an order to be dealt with by the Chancery Paymaster the order shall state the rate per centum at which, and (if the day to which interest is payable can be fixed by the order) the day inclusive to which such interest is computed, and the amount of such interest.

If the day to which interest is to be computed cannot be fixed by the order, the day from which (exclusive) such interest is to be computed shall (except in the case of a computation of subsequent interest from the foot of the certificate of a chief clerk, or a Master in Lunacy) be stated in the order, and such interest may be directed to be computed and certified by a chief clerk, or a Master in Lunacy, or (where the computation is dependent upon the taxation of costs) by a taxing master.

When interest is certified by a chief clerk, or a Master in Lunacy, or a taxing master, such interest may, unless the order otherwise directs, be computed to a day subsequent to the date of the certificate and to be named therein as the day for payment, so as to allow a reasonable time for doing all necessary acts to enable the payment to be made; and the chief clerk, or Master in Lunacy, or taxing master, may, if he thinks fit, require a statement in writing of such computation, authenticated by the signature of the solicitor of the person having the carriage of the order, to be produced before preparing the certificate, but no affidavit verifying such computation shall be required.

When the day for payment cannot be fixed by the order, and the interest is not directed to be certified in manner aforesaid, the order may direct the interest to the day for payment to be ascertained by an affidavit, or by a statutory declaration under the 5 and 6 William 4, c. 62, in which case such interest shall be computed to a day (inclusive) to be named in such affidavit or declaration, as the day for payment, and which day shall not be more than ten days after the day of swearing such affidavit, or making such declaration; and such affidavit or declaration shall be a sufficient authority to the Chancery Paymaster to pay or apply the amount of interest so ascertained in the manner directed by such order.

And in every case in which interest is to be computed, income tax (if any) shall, in making such computation, be de-

deducted therefrom at the rate payable during the time such interest accrues, unless the order otherwise directs; and it shall be stated in every such affidavit or declaration as aforesaid that income tax, if any, has been deducted.—(Substituted for original rule 8.)

11. Whenever the dealing by the Chancery Paymaster with money or securities in court, is, by an order, made contingent upon the execution of some document, the document shall be described, and the parties thereto by whom it is to be executed shall be named in an order, or in a certificate of a Master in Lunacy, or of a chief clerk. The execution of such document shall be certified by a Master in Lunacy, or by a chief clerk, or may be verified by affidavit, if the order by which such execution is required shall so direct.—(Part of original rule 7 amended.)

12. Persons who are directed by an order to pay or transfer into, or deposit in court any money or securities, and persons to whom money or securities are directed to be paid, transferred, or delivered, and persons for or during whose lives or other less period, payments are directed to be made, shall be described in the order, or in a certificate of a chief clerk, or a Master in Lunacy, or a taxing master, by name, and not merely as plaintiffs or petitioners, or the like; unless such payments, transfers, or deliveries are to be made to trustees or other persons in succession, or to representatives when no probate or letters of administration shall have been taken out at the date of such order or certificate. Bodies corporate, companies, or societies shall be described by their proper titles or designations, and the Christian names and surnames, or titles of honour, of all other such persons shall be expressed in words at length and without abbreviations in such orders or certificates, the Christian names preceding the surnames.—(Cons. Order 23, rule 5, amended.)

13. Every order directing the payment of dividends, annuities, or other periodical payments to be made by the Chancery Paymaster shall (except in the case of dividends directed to be paid as they accrue due), specify the time when the first of such payments, and when all subsequent periodical payments, whether quarterly, half-yearly, yearly, or otherwise, shall be made.—(Cons. Order 23, rule 6, amended.)

14. Every order directing the payment of money, or the transfer or delivery of securities in court, in respect of which duty shall be payable to the revenue under the Acts relating to legacy or succession duty, shall, unless such order expressly provides for the payment of the duty, also direct the Chancery Paymaster to have regard to the circumstance that such duty is payable; and when by an order money or securities, in respect of which such duty may be chargeable, are directed to be invested, carried over, or placed to a separate account, the words "subject to legacy duty" or "subject to succession duty," as the case may be, shall be added in the order to the title of the account thereby directed to be raised. Every order providing for payment, out of money or the proceeds of securities in court, of any duty payable under the Acts relating to legacy or succession duty shall direct that the amount of such duty shall, upon the requisition of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, be transferred to the account of the Receiver General of Inland Revenue at the bank.—(Cons. Order 23, rule 9, amended.)

15. Every order made after the commencement of these rules, which is to be acted upon by the Chancery Paymaster (except reports of the Masters in Lunacy, confirmed by fiat, and orders drawn up by the Registrar in Lunacy), shall be drawn up by and entered with the registrars of the court; and every order to be acted upon by the Chancery Paymaster (except the said reports), shall either be wholly printed, or in cases in which printed forms can be used, may be partly printed and partly written; provided that the registrars may issue any such orders in writing, if of an urgent nature.

The printing of orders shall be under the control of the registrars, and the orders shall be printed on cream wove, machine made, foolscap folio paper, 18 lbs. per mill ream, or thereabouts, in pica type leaded, with an inner margin about three-quarters of an inch wide, and an outer margin about two inches and a half wide, except as to the schedule or tabular statement in any such order contained or referred to, which may be printed in such smaller type as the registrars shall direct.

Sums occurring in the body of every such order shall be expressed in words; dates occurring therein, and any sums in such schedule or tabular statement as mentioned in rule 9, shall be expressed in figures instead of words; and each

separate direction in such orders shall (as far as may be) be contained in a distinct paragraph; and in all other respects such orders shall be printed in such form and manner as the registrars shall deem expedient.

16. Clerical mistakes or errors arising from any accidental slip or omission in such printed orders may be amended in writing; but no amendment shall be made in any order, to provide for a new state of circumstances arising after the date of the order; nor shall any order be amended for the purpose of extending the time thereby limited for making any payment, or transfer into, or deposit in court of money or securities; and every such amendment shall be stamped by the clerks of entries, or by the record and writ clerks, with their official seal, as evidence that the duplicate or record has been also amended.

17. The registrars of the court shall be provided with official stamps or seals for the authentication of orders and other documents, and of amendments therein.

18. The registrars shall cause a duplicate of every printed or partly printed order to be made at the same time with the original; and the original order shall be passed by a registrar in the usual way, and stamped with his official seal on every leaf thereof, and be transmitted by him to the clerks of entries with the duplicate.

The duplicate order shall be retained and filed by the clerks of entries as the record, and the original order when examined and stamped by them, and marked with a reference thereon to the duplicate or record so filed, shall be returned to the registrar to be delivered out to the solicitor of the party having the carriage of the order.

19. The registrars may cause to be printed additional copies of printed orders, or printed portions of orders, according to the requirements of the parties or their solicitors, and such additional copies shall be transmitted to the report office; and when such printed or partly printed orders have been passed and entered, such additional copies upon being duly completed and signed or certified by one of the clerks of records and writs, and authenticated in the same manner as written office copies of orders, or copies certified pursuant to the Act of the 14 and 15 Vict. c. 99, s. 14, are now signed or certified and authenticated, may be issued as office or certified copies.

20. Rules 15 and 16 shall, so far as applicable, extend to and include orders in lunacy to be acted upon by the Chancery Paymaster, drawn up by the Registrar in Lunacy, but the printing thereof shall be exclusively under the direction and control of the Registrar in Lunacy; and such orders shall be entered by him in the manner prescribed by section 100 of the Lunacy Regulation Act, 1853 (16 and 17 Vict. c. 70).

III.—Copies of Orders, and other Documents to be sent to Chancery Audit Office.

21. An office copy of every order drawn up by the registrars of the court to be acted upon by the Chancery Paymaster, duly signed and authenticated in the manner prescribed in rule 19, shall be transmitted by the clerks of records and writs to the Chancery Audit Office; and in case of any amendments being made in the order, such office copy shall, upon production thereof to the clerks of records and writs, be likewise amended.

22. An office copy of every certificate of a chief clerk, or of a taxing master, or of a Master in Lunacy, which is to be acted upon by the Chancery Paymaster, and an office copy of all directions contained in the report of a Master in Lunacy confirmed by fiat, which are to be acted upon by the Chancery Paymaster, shall, when requested, be transmitted by the clerks of records and writs, or by the Registrar in Lunacy, as the case may be, to the Chancery Audit Office.

23. An office copy of every order in lunacy to be acted upon by the Chancery Paymaster when signed and sealed or stamped with the seal of the Registrar in Lunacy, as required by sections 100 and 101 of the Lunacy Regulation Act, 1853, and section 29 of the Lunacy Regulation Act, 1862 (25 & 26 Vict. c. 86), shall be transmitted by the Registrar in Lunacy to the Chancery Audit Office.

24. An office copy of any affidavit, or of any statutory declaration filed as provided in rule 86, which may be received in evidence by the Chancery Paymaster, shall, when requested, be transmitted by the clerks of records and writs to the Chancery Audit Office.

IV.—Bringing Funds into Court.

25. Money and securities may be paid or transferred into, or deposited in, court, and be placed in the books at the Chancery Pay Office to the credit of a cause or matter, on a direction to be obtained from the Chancery Paymaster, upon the written request of the person desirous of so paying, transferring, or depositing, or of his solicitor, without an order; but no such payment, transfer, or deposit shall be so made to a separate account in a cause (except to a security for costs account), unless such separate account has been directed to be opened by an order, and such request shall be filed in the report office. This rule shall not apply to money, or securities, directed by an order to be paid or transferred into, or deposited in, court, nor shall it apply to money or securities payable or transferable into court, in pursuance of an Act of Parliament, or a general order of the court, by which some particular authority is required to enable the payment, transfer, or deposit to be made.—(Original rule 10 amended.)

26. Every request for a direction for payment or transfer into, or deposit in, court, of money or securities to be placed to the credit of a cause commenced since 1st November, 1852, shall contain the title of the cause and the reference to the record as cited in rule 2, and the correctness of such reference shall be authenticated by the official seal of the clerks of records and writs being impressed on such request.—(Original rule 11.)

27. A person directed by any order to make a payment or transfer into or deposit in court shall be at liberty to make the same without further order, notwithstanding the order may not have been served, or the time thereby limited for making such payment, transfer, or deposit may have expired; and if any further sum of money has by reason of such default become payable by such person for interest, or in respect of dividends, he shall be at liberty to pay into court such further sum upon a request as provided by rule 25; provided that any such subsequent payment, transfer, or deposit shall not affect or prejudice any liability, process, or other consequences which such person may have become subject to by reason of his default in making the same within the time so limited. The time for making any such payment, transfer, or deposit may be also, if necessary, extended by a supplemental order, referring to the former order, but without repeating the directions for such payment, transfer, or deposit. Such supplemental order may be made on an application to the judge at chambers.

28. When money or securities are to be paid into, or deposited in, court, such payment or deposit shall be made with the privy of the Chancery Paymaster, and the Chancery Paymaster shall issue a direction to the bank to receive and place the same to the credit of the Chancery Pay Office account; and such direction shall specify the title of the cause or matter to which such money or securities are to be placed in the books at the Chancery Pay Office; and upon such money or securities being so paid or deposited, the bank shall cause a receipt to be given for the same, and shall send such direction to the Chancery Pay Office, with a certificate thereon, that the money or securities therein specified have been received, and placed to the credit of the Chancery Pay Office account.—(Original rule 9 amended.)

29. When securities are to be transferred into court, such transfer shall be made with the privy of the Chancery Paymaster, and the Chancery Paymaster shall issue a direction for the transfer to be made to the account of the Paymaster-General for the time being on behalf of the Court of Chancery; and such direction shall specify the title of the cause or matter to which such securities are to be placed in the books at the Chancery Pay Office; and upon such securities being so transferred, the bank, or body corporate, or company, in whose books the transfer of such securities is made or registered, shall send such direction to the Chancery Pay Office, with a certificate thereon, that the securities therein specified have been transferred to the said account.—(Original rule 15 amended.)

30. When any such direction as is mentioned in the last two preceding rules with a certificate thereon that the amount of money or securities therein-mentioned has been so paid, transferred, or deposited, shall be received at the Chancery Pay Office, the Chancery Paymaster shall file a certificate of such payment, transfer, or deposit, and shall therein state the title of the cause or matter to which such amount of money or securities has been placed in the books at the Chancery Pay Office; and an office copy of such certificate of

the Chancery Paymaster shall be received as evidence of the payment or transfer into, or deposit in, court, therein-mentioned having been made.—(Original rule 16 amended.)

31. When it is desired to bring money into court without waiting the time necessary to obtain a direction for the bank to receive such money it may be lodged at the bank to the credit of a Chancery suspense account (subject to being dealt with as hereinafter mentioned, and not otherwise), upon a written application signed by the person desiring to lodge the same, or his solicitor, and addressed to the bank, specifying the amount, and the title of the cause or matter in Chancery in respect of which it is desired to be lodged, and upon such lodgment being made one of the cashiers of the bank shall give a certificate that the amount has been lodged to the credit of a Chancery suspense account; and in every case the person making such lodgment, or his solicitor, shall forthwith bespeak the direction for the bank to receive the money in the manner provided by rule 28, and produce such direction and certificate at the bank, for the purpose of having the money so previously lodged transferred to the Chancery Pay Office account, and placed in the books at the Chancery Pay Office to the credit of the cause or matter mentioned in such direction, and the receipt mentioned in the said rule 28 shall thereupon be given for such money.—(Original rule 12.)

32. Money hereafter paid into court pursuant to the 69th section of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, in respect of lands in England or Wales, shall be placed in the books at the Chancery Pay Office to the credit of ex parte the promoters of the undertaking, in the matter of the special Act (citing it), as directed by the said Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, and some words shall be added in each case briefly expressive of the nature of the disability to sell and convey, by reason of which the money shall be so paid in, as stated in the request for the direction to receive the money.—(Original rule 13.)

33. Money hereafter paid into court pursuant to the Copyhold Acts shall be placed in the books at the Chancery Pay Office to the credit of "Ex parte the Copyhold Commissioners," as directed by the said Acts, and in addition thereto, to the account of the particular manor in respect of which the money shall be so paid in; and in the request for a direction to receive such money the name and locality of such particular manor shall be stated.—(Original rule 14.)

34. A trustee or other person desiring to pay money or transfer securities into, or deposit securities in, court, under the Act 10 & 11 Vict. c. 96, shall file an affidavit, entitled in the matter of the same Act, and in the matter of the trust, and setting forth—

- (1.) His own name and address.
- (2.) The place where he is to be served with any petition, summons, or order, or with notice of any proceeding relating to such money or securities.
- (3.) The amount of money and description and amount of securities which he proposes to pay or transfer into, or deposit in, court, and the credit to which he wishes it to be placed; and if such money or securities are chargeable with legacy or succession duty, a statement whether such duty or any part thereof has or has not been paid.
- (4.) A short description of the trust, and of the instrument creating it.
- (5.) The names of the persons interested in or entitled to the money or securities, and their places of residence, to the best of his knowledge and belief.
- (6.) His submission to answer all such inquiries relating to the application of the money or securities paid or transferred into, or deposited in, court under the same Act, as the court or judge may make or direct.
- (7.) A statement whether the money so to be paid into court, or the dividends on the securities so to be transferred into, or deposited in, court, and all accumulations of dividends thereon, are desired to be invested in consolidated £3 per centum annuities, or reduced £3 per cent. annuities, or new £3 per cent. annuities, or whether it is deemed unnecessary so to invest the same or to place the same on deposit.

The Chancery Paymaster, on production of an office copy of any such affidavit, shall give the necessary directions for such payment, transfer, or deposit to the account of the particular trust mentioned in the affidavit.

The regulations contained in the General Order of the court of the 16th day of May, 1862, for the printing of affidavits to be used on the hearing of a cause, shall be appli-

cable to affidavits filed under this rule, and the Chancery Paymaster shall not act upon an office copy of any such affidavit, filed after the commencement of these rules, which is not so printed.—(Cons. Order 41, rules 1 and 2 amended.)

35. Any principal money or dividends received by the bank in respect of securities standing to the Chancery Pay Office account shall be placed in the books at the Chancery Pay Office, in the case of principal money, to the credit to which the securities whereon such money arose were standing at the time of the receipt thereof, and in the case of dividends, to the credit to which the securities whereon such dividends accrued were standing at the time of the closing of the transfer books of such securities previously to the dividends becoming due.

V.—Payment of Money, and Sale Transfer, or Delivery of Securities, out of Court.—Conversion of Government Securities.—Application of Dividends and Interest.

36. Subject to rules 46, 47, 48, 49, 62, 63, and 66, securities in court shall not be sold, transferred, or delivered out, and money in court shall not be paid out or invested in securities, and money or securities in court shall not be carried over, and a certificate shall not be issued for the sale, transfer, or delivery of securities in court, unless in pursuance of an order, or in the case of an investment of money or application of dividends, of a direction contained in a certificate of a Master in Lunacy as authorized by the 64th section of the Lunacy Regulation Act, 1853, or by any general orders made thereunder.—(Original rule 17 amended.)

37. When an order, or a certificate of a Master in Lunacy, directs the carrying over of money or securities in court, or the investment, or placing on deposit (subject to rule 71), or payment out, of money in court, or of dividends to accrue on securities in court, the Chancery Paymaster may defer giving effect to such direction until a request in writing to give effect thereto has been left at the Chancery Pay Office, but it shall be the duty of the solicitor for the person having the carriage of such order or certificate to leave it and such request at the Chancery Pay Office without unnecessary delay.—(Original rule 23 amended.)

38. When money in court is to be paid out (except in the cases provided for by rules 41, 57, and 58, and by the 4th and 5th of the general orders in Lunacy of 10th January, 1870), the Chancery Paymaster shall cause a cheque or other sufficient authority or direction for the payment of the same to be issued. Such cheque or authority or direction for payment, shall state the title of the cause or matter in the books at the Chancery Pay Office to which the money paid is to be debited, the date of the order or other authority in pursuance of which, and the name of the person to whom the payment is to be made, or so much of the particulars of such payment as the Chancery Paymaster may deem necessary; and such cheque or authority or direction, duly endorsed by the payee named therein or his lawful attorney, or an acknowledgment of receipt signed by such payee or his attorney, shall be a good discharge to the Chancery Paymaster for the amount therein mentioned.—(Original rule 18 amended.)

39. Money in court periodically payable at the commencement of the Chancery Funds Rules, 1872, shall continue to be payable by the Chancery Paymaster in pursuance and on the authority of the entries of the cheques for periodical payments in the receipt books in the Accountant-General's office, or of such other documents as the Accountant-General had been accustomed to use in the preparation of such cheques, without the production of the orders and other documents in pursuance whereof such payments are made, being necessary.—(Original rule 19 amended.)

(To be continued.)

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Jan. 15, 1875.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92½
Ditto for Account, Feb. 92½
3 per Cent. Reduced, 92½
New 3 per Cent., 92½
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '78
Annuities, Jan. '80 —

Annuities, April, '87, 92
Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
Ex Bille, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 2 dis.
Ditto, £500, Do 2 dis.
Ditto, £100 & £500, 2 dis.
Bank of England Stock, 5 per
Ct. (last half-year), 255
Ditto for Account.

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price.
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	117
Stock Caledonian	100	97½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	98½
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	41½
Stock Great Northern	100	138½
Stock Do., A Stock	100	156½
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	109
Stock Great Western—Original	100	107½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	141½
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	94½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	23½
Stock London and North-Western	100	147
Stock London and South Western	100	114½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	74½
Stock Metropolitan	100	78
Stock Do., District	100	32½
Stock Midland	100	139½
Stock North British	100	68
Stock North Eastern	100	166
Stock North London	100	113
Stock North Staffordshire	100	58
Stock South Devon	100	58
Stock South-Eastern	100	113½

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The bank rate has again been reduced from five per cent. to four per cent. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has risen from 40·02 per cent. last week to 45·13 per cent. this week. At the beginning of the week the home railway market was dull, but it improved on Tuesday, and on Thursday there was a general rise in prices, the exceptions being the Great Western and Sheffield. In the foreign market up to Wednesday prices were generally firm, but considerable fluctuations were reported on Thursday. Consols closed on Thursday 92½ to 1 for money, and 92½ to 1 for the account.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

Jan. 14.—By Messrs. MARSH, YETTS, & MILNER.
Hoxton—The Prince Albert Tavern, and Nos. 20, 21, and 22, George's-square, freehold. Sold £2,000.

By Messrs. TOPPIS & HARDING.

Somers Town—Nos. 38, 39, 40, 43, and 44, Charlton-street, term 12 years. Sold £1,185.
No. 59, Chapel-street, same term. Sold £425.

By Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE.

Bromley-by-Bow—No. 2, St. Leonard's-street, and house adjoining, freehold. Sold £1,780.
Limehouse—Nos. 17 and 18, Copenhagen-terrace, term 66 years. Sold £300.
Ratcliff—Nos. 9 and 10, Henry-street, term 18 years. Sold £240.
Commercial-road—Nos. 11, 13, 15, and 17, Hungerford-street, term five years. Sold £50.
Plaistow—Nos. 2 and 3, Grove-terrace, freehold. Sold £310.
Mile-end—Nos. 3 and 4, Eastbury-street, term 78 years. Sold £590.
Stepney—No. 102, Clark-street, term 26 years. Sold £110.
Mile-end—No. 24, Norfolk-street, term 32 years. Sold £238.
St. George's East—Nos. 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12, Sanders-street, term 27 years. Sold £450.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

ANDREW—On Jan. 11, at Arundel House, Lewisham, Kent, the wife of Edwin Andrew, solicitor, of a daughter.
BUTLER—On Jan. 7, at Julian-hill, Harrow, the wife of Spencer Percival Butler, barrister-at-law, of a son.
DYNE—On Jan. 13, at Coombe House, Hampstead-lane, Highgate, the wife of John Bradley Dyne, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a son.
FREEMAN—On Jan. 14, at 37, Thornhill-square, N., the wife of George D. Freeman, solicitor, of a daughter.
HARMSWORTH—On Dec. 26, at 13, Grove-end-road, N.W., the wife of Alfred Harmsworth, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.
LAING—On Jan. 6, at 56, Addison-road, Kensington, the wife of John G. Laing, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
MARSHAM—On Jan. 13, at 62, Gloucester-place, Portman-square, the wife of R. H. B. Marsham, Esq., of a son.
SAUNDERS—On Jan. 9, at Finchley, the wife of Albert Saunders, solicitor, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

FENTON-SMITH—On Jan. 2, at Sunderland, Geo. Rattray Fenton, Esq., barrister-at-law, to Annie Sophia, second daughter of the late Edw. Smith, Esq.

GRESHAM-NORTHCOTE—On Jan. 14, at St. Matthew's Church, Brixton, Thomas Gresham, of Warwick-road, Maida-hill-west, solicitor, to Ellen Jane, elder daughter of Stafford Henry Northcote, Esq., of Shenley Lodge, West Brixton.

PECKHAM-ATTREE—On Jan. 12, at Mildmay-park, Islington, William Peckham, solicitor, of Tottenham and Doctors'-commons, to Mary Richens, eldest daughter of William Orton Attree, of Oakley-road, Southgate-road, Islington.

STREET-WATSON—On Jan. 9, at Haverstock-hill, Thomas Street, of 27, Lincoln's-inn-fields, solicitor, to Ann Spencer, second daughter of Joseph Watson, Esq., of Maitland-park-villas, Haverstock-hill.

WASTENEYS-FARDELL—On Jan. 7, at St. Mary of the Angels, Worthing, William Wasteneys, Esq., Middle Temple, to Julia Marianne, only daughter of the late Charles Fardell, Esq., J.P., D.L., of Holbeck Lodge, Lincolnshire.

DEATHS.

JENKINSON—On Jan. 8, Charles Thomas Jenkinson, of Antron House, Upper Tulse-hill, and Corbet-court, Gracechurch-street, aged 62.

UPTON—On Jan. 7, at Priory Leas, Folkestone, Archer Thomas Upton, Esq., of 20, Austinfriars, London, aged 73.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, JAN. 8, 1875.

Yewdall, Henry, Wm. H. Yewdall, and Jno. W. Binns, Bradford, Attorneys and Solicitors. Jan 6

TUESDAY, JAN. 12, 1875.

Borlase, James John Grenfell, and John Robinson, Mitcheldean, Gloucester, Attorneys and Solicitors. Dec 31
Simpson, John James, William Grimwood Taylor, Alfred Robert Simpson, and Adolphus Grimwood Taylor, Derby, Attorneys and Solicitors. Jan 6

Warrand, Alexander, and Joseph William Parry, Ludgate hill, London, Attorneys and Solicitors. Dec 23

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, JAN. 8, 1875.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Dando and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 6, directed to be heard on Jan 16. Mayhew, Walbrook, solicitor for the petitioners.

STANNARIES OF DEVON AND CORNWALL.

Leeds Tin Mine Company.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 4, directed to be heard before the Vice Warden, at the Prince's Hall, Truro, on Jan 16, at 12. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the Registrar's Office, Truro, or before Jan 14, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioners, their solicitors, or their agents. Hodge and Co, Truro, petitioners' solicitors, Gregory and Co, Bedford row, agents.

Native Iron Ore Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 2, directed to be heard before the Vice Warden, at the Law Institution, Chancery lane, on Jan 16, at 12.30. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the Registrar's Office, Truro, on or before Jan 13, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioners, their solicitors, or their agents. Caryon and Paul, Truro, agents for Needham, New inn, solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, JAN. 12, 1875.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

African Barter Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Victor Bauer, San court, Cornhill. May 5, at 1, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Civil-Bugall Slate Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 8, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Jan 22. Lyne and Holman, St Winchester st, solicitors for the petitioner.
Peat Coal and Charcoal Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 7, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins, on Jan 22. West and King, Cannon st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, JAN 12, 1875.

Early Blossom Lodge of the Independent Order of Oddfellows, Manchester Unity, Bradford Arms Inn, Shipley, York. Dec 31
Haley Benefit Society, East Haley, Berks. Jan 2

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, JAN. 8, 1875.

Levi, John, Freetown, Africa, Merchant. March 31. Davison v Levi, Registrar for the Liverpool District.
Shuckford, James, Feltham, Middlesex, Brewer. Jan 30. Flynn v Shuckford, M.R. Pead, Parliament st, Westminster
Williams, John, Scarborough, York, Builder. Feb 9. Taylor v McKisley, M.L. Taylor, Scarborough

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 85.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, JAN. 8, 1875.

Baker, William, Rochester, Kent. Feb 1. Bassett, Rochester
Barlow, Edward, Bury, Lancashire, Jan 30. Sharpley, Louth
Coley, William, Little Tower st, Commission Agent. Feb 28. Parkes, Bedford row
Clark, John, Secker, Aylsham, Norfolk, Currier. March 1. Forster, Aylsham
Farmer, Mary, But', Cheltenham, Gloucester. Feb 15. Palmer, Cheltenham
Fraser, John, Nassau place, Commercial rd, Boot Manufacturer. Feb 5. Morris and Co, Fishbury circus
Grant, Mary, Habrough, Lincoln. Jan 30. Sharpley, Louth
Hawkins, Jane, Yately, Southampton. Jan 31. Bayley, Basingstoke
Higgett, Harriett, Stourton, Wilts. Feb 8. Higgett, Field house, Richmond rd, Montpelier, Bristol
Holden, Richard, Liverpool, Adjutant 1st Lanc. Rif. March 1. Snowball and Co, Liverpool
Honywood, Rev Philip, James, Wakes Colne, Essex. March 10. Barnes, Chichester
Jones, Alfred, Queen st, Cheapside, Gent. Feb 13. Barn, Gresham st
Low, Charlotte, Nottingham. Feb 1. Acton, Nottingham
Mackie, William, George Forbridge, Stafford. Captain H.M.'s 96th Regt. March 1. Griffiths and Co, Birmingham
Marsden, Samuel, Southport, Lancashire, Screw Bolt Manufacturer. March 20. Southam, Manchester
Marsland, Betty, Altham, Lancashire. Feb 4. Whalley, Accrington
Newhouse, Charles, Martin, Heywood, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. July 5. Whitaker, Lancaster place, Strand
Parks, Thomas, Kirkdale, Liverpool. March 1. Bremner and Son, Liverpool
Pimm, Timothy, Kirk Langley, Derby. March 1. Cooke, Derby
Rigley, Harriet, Burwood place, Hyde park. Feb 19. Aldridge and Thorn, Bedford row
Schofield, John, Todmorden, Chemist. Feb 20. Eastwood, Todmorden
Soame, Henry, Edward, Aylsham, Norfolk, Farmer. March 1. Forster, Aylsham
Spraggett, John, Banbury, Oxford, Gent. Feb 6. Welchman, Southam
Steel, Henry, Liverpool, Gent. March 31. Whitley and Maddock, Liverpool
Taylor, James, Scout, near Newchurch, Lancaster, Felt Manufacturer. Feb 8. Hargreaves and Knowles, Newchurch, Russendale
Vipond, John, Lancaster Upper, Mousmouth, Esq. March 20. Greenway and Sytheaway, Pontypool
Watts, Emma, Barbara, Abington rd, Kensington. Feb 1. Kisch and Co, Wellington st, Strand
Woodcock, Edward, Humphrey, Akinoor, India, Lieut-Col. H.M.I.A. March 31. Wragge and Co, Birmingham
Wormald, John, Temple bar, Esq. March 1. Carlisle and Ordell, New square, Lincoln's inn

TUESDAY, JAN. 12, 1875.

Abbott, Samuel, Bristol, Gent. March 25. Piummer, Bristol
Arbutnot, William, Urquhart, Bexley, Kent, Esq. March 15. Francis, Austinfriars
Beaton, Rev Benjamin, Wrigglesworth, Charles st, St Luke. March 1. Spaul, Verulam buildings, Gray's inn
Brine, Henry, William, Tarrant Crawford, Dorset, Farmer. Feb 23. Tanner, Wimborne Minster
Carney, James, Church st, Edmonton, Gent. March 1. Proudfoot, John st, Bedford row
Carter, Alice, Audenshaw, Lancashire. Feb 9. Norris and Wood, Manchester
Chamber, Ralph, Erskine, Freshpool st, Horsleydowns. Feb 25. Fennell, Queen st, Southwark
Darbyshire, Charles, Henry, Viewsey, Middlesex, Waste Paper Merchant. Feb 10. Murray and Co, Birchlin lane
Douglas, Anne, Clifton, Bristol. March 5. Lambert and Petch, John st, Bedford row
Dutton, James, Theresa place, Hammersmith, Surgeon. Feb 27. Baddeley and Son, Leman st, Goodman's fields
Emery, Charles, Bate, Sussex. March 1. Raper and Ellman, Battle
Foot, Nicholas, Rogers, Golberdon, Cornwall, Gent. Feb 13. Peier, Callington
Gooden, Thomas, Hale, Cheshire, Farmer. Jan 23. Nicholls and Co, Altrincham
Holland, William, John, Oxford st, Grocer. March 9. Edwards and Co, Ely place, Holborn circus
Hood, Thomas, Gloucester cottage, Peckham Rye, Journalist. Feb 10. Gammon, Barge yard, Hocklerys yard
Hughes, John, Wodley, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Esq. March 1. Bubb and Co, Cheltenham
Jones, Wolryche, Harry Whitmore, Chastleton, Oxford, Esq. March 31. Sowell and Co, Cirencester
Maxwell, Robert, Liverpool, Merchant. Jan 28. Fletcher, Liverpool
Petrie, Harriet, Jane Gilbert, Surbiton, Surrey. July 1. Dowse, New inn, Strand
Potts, George, South Shields, Durham, Esq. March 1. Purvis, South Shields
Punfield, Charles, Bristol, Gent. April 1. Brittain and Co, Bristol
Rogers, Mary, Ann, Hanover square. March 1. Hyde and Co, Ely place, Holborn
Saint Albyn, Langley, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Esq. Feb 12. Smith, Weston-super-Mare
Spence, Lewis, Henry, The Grove, Kentish Town, Merchant. Feb 15. Henderson, Basinghall st
Thompson, Edward, James, Richmond gardens, Shepherd's Bush. Feb 20. Lacy, King's Bench walk, Temple
Townend, George, Mincing lane, Tea Broker. April 30. Foster, Queen st place, Cannon st
Tuke, John, Batt, son, Birmingham, Gent. March 15. Smith, Birmingham
Wake, Charles, Hamilton, Crosthwaite, Cumberland, Esq. March 1. Broadb, Kewick
Warberton, William, Newman, Boundary rd, St John's wood, Esq. Feb 13. Roy and Cartwright, Lothbury

Ward, William, Huntingdon, Esq. March 1. Margetts and Son, Hunt
ingdon
Wester, John, Belkoff, Lincoln, Farmer. Feb 1. Collinson and Co,
Egworth
Williamson, James Shaw, Salford, Lancashire, Gent. Feb 20. Wood,
Manchester

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Jan. 8, 1875.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Birford, Stanley, Tachbrook st, Piccolo, Ironmonger. Pet Jan 5.
Brougham, Jan 21 at 11
Northmore, Mary, Edgware rd, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet Sept 24.
Spring-Rice. Jan 21 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Craig, John, Mostyn, Flint, Coal Dealer. Pet Dec 31. Williamson.
Cheshire. Jan 20 at 12
Davies, David, Carmarthen, Ironmonger. Pet Dec 28. Lloyd. Car-
marthen, Feb 20 at 1
Heller, John Samuel, Axminster, Devon, Accountant. Pet Jan 6.
Daw. Exeter. Jan 20 at 11
Belt, George, Hanley, Stafford, Milliner. Pet Dec 31. Challinor.
Hanley, Jan 20 at 11
Jeffries, Robert Hall, Plumstead, Norfolk, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 1.
Cooke. Norwich, Jan 20 at 12
Leadbetter, William Austin, Melton Mowbray, Leicester, Grocer. Pet
Jan 6. Ingram. Leicester, Jan 31 at 12

TUESDAY, Jan. 12, 1875.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Smith, Charles, Culmore rd, Old Kent rd, no occupation. Pet Jan 7.
Pepps. Jan 26 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Burgess, George, Ramsgate, Kent, Bank Manager. Pet Jan 8. Call-
away. Canterbury, Jan 22 at 3
Gale, James Edward, Rock Ferry, Cheshire. Pet Jan 5. Wason. Birken-
head, Jan 22 at 12
Mander, Aaron, Launceston, Cornwall, Watchmaker. Pet Jan 7.
Gidley. East Stonehouse, Jan 25 at 12
Pitt, Richard, Preston, Lancashire, Corn Miller's Assistant. Pet Jan 7.
Hilton. Preston, Jan 28 at 11
Thompson, Charles, West Hartlepool, Durham, Grocer. Pet Jan 9.
Ellis. Sunderland, Jan 25 at 12

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Jan. 8, 1875.

Ehys, Charles eurent, Wandls rd, Wandsworth common, no occupation.

Jan 5

Richardson, Frederick Lowry, Liverpool, Stationer. Jan 4

TUESDAY, Jan. 12, 1875.

Jones, Catherine, Collins st, Blackheath. Jan 8

Liquidation by Arrangement.**FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.**

FRIDAY, Jan. 8, 1875.

Adams, William, Brighton, Sussex, Schoolmaster. Jan 27 at 3 at the
Old Ship Hotel, Brighton. Verrall, Brighton
Atkinson, Thomas, and James Atkinson, Bolton, Lancashire, Builders.
Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Hall, Acres field, Bolton
Bellman, Ernest Edmund, Widdicombe terrace, Barking rd, Brewer.
Jan 21 at 3 at offices of Christmas, Walbrook
Bennett, John, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Registrar of Births. Jan 29
at 3 at offices of Cheshire, Regent st, Cheltenham
Bland, Thomas Little, Washborough, Lincoln, Corn Merchant. Jan 23
at 11 at offices of Toynbee and Larken, Bank at, Lincoln
Bloomer, Benjamin Giles, Peisall, Stafford, Consulting Engineer. Jan 26
at 11 at offices of Duignan and Co, Bridge, Walsall
Bradbury, John, Hanley, Stafford, Fishmonger. Jan 14 at 10.15 at
the Crews Arms Hotel, Crewe. Stevens, Hanley
Brown, John Goff-rh, Great Grimsby, Lincoln, Grocer. Jan 16 at 11
at offices of Grange and Winttingham, West St Mary's gate, Great
Grimsby
Calf, Thomas Worthington, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Lancashire,
Tailor. Jan 27 at 3 at offices of Mann, Cooper st, Manchester
Clothen, Jacob, Warner at, New Kent rd, Baker. Jan 22 at 4 at offices
of Stratton and Co, Old Kent rd
Campbell, Thomas, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Boot Dealer. Jan 22
at 3 at the Ship Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Edwards and
Bentley, Manchester
Carter, James, Bradford, York, Stuff Merchant. Jan 23 at 10 at
offices of Berry and Robinson, Charles st, Bradford
Casson, James, Sheffield, Licensed Victualler. Jan 18 at 3 at offices of
Porrett, Queen st, Sheffield
Ciebury, Aaron, Smallthorpe, Stafford, Colliery Bailiff. Jan 21 at 3
at the Saracen's Head Hotel, Hanley. Llewellyn and Ackrill,
Tunstall
Cooper, Archambo, and Charles Ion Cooper, Eastbourne, Sussex.
Eversens. Jan 21 at 12 at the Star Hotel, Lewes. Wheatcroft, East-
bourne
Cotterell, Edward, Derby, Timber Merchant. Jan 21 at 12 at the
County Hotel, St Mary's gate, Derby. Heath, Derby
Crawley, Joseph, Jun, Toddington, Bedford, Butcher. Jan 21 at 3 at
the Bell Hotel, Toddington. Stimson, Bedford
Crompton, William, Birmingham, Baker. Jan 21 at 12 at offices of
Fowke, Ann at, Birmingham
Crock, James, sen, Bath, Fishmonger. Jan 15 at 11.30 at 5, Westgate
buildings, Bath
Dale, John, Penzance, Cornwall, Grocer. Jan 19 at 11 at offices of
Roscoble and Son, North parade, Penzance
Downs, William Francis, Twerton, Somerset, and James Hunt, Bath,
Builders. Jan 30 at 12 at 1, Queen sq, Bath. Little
Eardley, William, sen, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Butcher. Jan 21
at 11 at offices of Litchfield, Bagnall st, Newcastle-under-Lyme
Edwards, William, Taunton, Somerset, Tailor. Jan 20 at 10 at 61,
South parade, Taunton

Fisher, Robert, Aberavon, Glamorgan, Fruiterer. Feb 1 at 3 at offices
of Tennant, Aberavon
Frith, Edward, New Close, Lincoln, Beerhouse Keeper. Jan 20 at 11
at offices of Haddesley, Royal Dock chambers, Great Grimsby
Gilkes, John, Grove Ash, Oxford, Farmer. Jan 19 at 11 at 42, High st,
Banbury. Kilby and Co, Chipmington
Gladstone, Henry, Lorne rd, Brixton rd, no occupation. Jan 29 at 3 at
offices of Vallance and Vallance, Essex st, Strand
Graham, George Henry, Maidstone, Kent, Printer. Jan 16 at 1 at
offices of Dormer, Moorgate st. Pullen, Cloisters, Temple
Green, Henry, Meltonby, York, Farmer. Jan 22 at 11 at the Old Red
Lion Inn, Pocklington. Powell, Pocklington
Hansen, Nicholas, Queen Victoria st, Merchants. Jan 27 at 12 at offices
of Billing and Yenn, Church court, Old Jewry
Histon, John Smethwick, Staff rd, Boot Maker. Jan 21 at 11 at offices
of Beaton, Victoria buildings, Temple row, Birmingham
Hopkins, Henry, and William Hopkins, Belvedere rd, Lambeth,
Lightermen. Jan 21 at 12 at offices of Plunkett, Gutter lane
Humphreys, George James, Club row, Bethnal Green, Poultry Sales-
man. Feb 4 at 12 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington.
Fenton
Hutchinson, Charles, Moss Side, Lancashire, Grocer. Jan 21 at 3 at
offices of Ritson, John Dalton st, Manchester
Jones, John, Aberaman, Glamorgan, Dealer in Furniture. Jan 21 at
12 at offices of Linton and Williams, Canon st, Aberdeen
Knight, Robert, Bristol, Clerk. Jan 16 at 1 at offices of Clifton, Corn
st, Bristol
Lenard, William Webb, St George's rd, Southwark, Billiard Table
Manufacturer. Jan 22 at 2 at offices of Blackford and Rhodes, Great
Swan alley, Moorgate st
Lewin, Ann, Coventry, Printer. Jan 18 at 3 at the County Court
Office, Little Park st, Coventry. Dewes and Co
Lewin, David, Coventry, Printer. Jan 18 at 3 at the County Court
Office, Little Park st, Coventry. Dewes and Co
Lewis, John, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Grocer. Jan 22 at 1 at offices of
Barnard and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol
Lewitt, William, Leicester, Builder. Jan 18 at 3 at offices of Orwston,
Friar lane, Leicester
Marshall, Thomas, Sowerby, York, Joiner. Jan 21 at 3 at the White
Horse Hotel, Hebdon Bridge. Craven, Todmorden
McHugh, Michael, Blackburn, Lancashire, Grocer. Jan 26 at 11 at
offices of Radcliffe, Clayton st, Blackburn
Moore, Charles, and John Dobson, Bradford, York, Masons. Jan 30 at
11 at offices of Peel and Gaunt, Chapel lane, Bradford
Moore, John, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Fruiterer. Jan 26 at 11
at Sharp's Hotel, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness. Taylor, Barrow-in-
Furness
Myerscough, Richard, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Builder. Jan
25 at 2 at the Ship Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Preston, Barrow-in-
Furness
Nathan, Harris, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Furniture Dealer. Jan 28
at 3 at offices of Stratton, Queen st, Wolverhampton
Naylor, Timothy, Hartshead-cum-Clifton, York, Clothier. Jan 25 at 3
at offices of Curry, Cleckheaton
Newey, Walter John, Birmingham, Corset Manufacturer. Jan 21 at 11
at offices of Boraston, Ann st, Birmingham
North, George, Spalding, Lincoln, Innkeeper. Jan 20 at 3 at offices of
Walker and Co, Spilsby
Oakley, James, Great Dunmow, Essex, Carter. Jan 25 at 2 at offices
of Snell, Great Dunmow
Parry, William, Brownhills, Stafford, Grocer. Jan 25 at 11 at offices
of Duignan and Co, Bridge, Walsall
Payne, John, Scarborough, York, Smack Owner. Jan 25 at 1 at offices
of Williamson, Newborough st, Scarborough
Perkins, William Moads, Elm grove, Hammersmith, Commercial
Traveller. Jan 25 at 2 at offices of Holland, Knight Rider st, Doctors'
common
Phippen, Thomas Edward, Monckton Farleigh, Wilts, Farmer. Jan 20
at 11.30 at offices of Wilson, Westgate buildings, Bath
Plater, William Charles, and James Wynn Allison, Alfred st, Step-
ney, Jute Dyers. Jan 27 at 3 at offices of Holmes, Eastcheap
Pulling, Thomas, Gower st, Church Decorator. Jan 18 at 2 at offices of
Veruede, Strand
Price, Roger, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Butcher. Jan 21 at 11 at offices of
Beddoe, Canon st, Aberdare
Prior, Francis Loder, Great Ormond st, Wine Merchant. Jan 23 at 12
at offices of Dixon and Co, Bedford row
Probert, James, Tate, Gloucester, Grocer. Jan 20 at 1 at offices of
Brittan and Co, Small st, Bristol
Rees, Ebenezer, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Harpist. Jan 22 at 11 at
offices of Smith and Co, Merthyr Tydfil
Rice, Stephen, Ballington, Essex, Innkeeper. Jan 20 at 2 at the Rose
and Crown Hotel, Sudbury. Mumford, Sudbury
Royle, Isaac, Jun, Worsley, Lancashire, Farm Bailiff. Jan 16 at 4 at
offices of Best, Lower King st, Manchester
Ryan, John, Liverpool, Grocer. Jan 20 at 2 at the Clarendon Rooms,
South John st, Liverpool
Scott, John, Liverpool, Corn Broker. Jan 25 at 2 at offices of Parkin-
son, Commerce court, Lord st, Liverpool
Selby, Charles Lewis, Elinor's yard, Old Bethnal green rd, Cabinet
Maker. Jan 16 at 11 at the Buck's Head, Chilton st, Bethnal green rd
Shaw, George, Swinton, York, Joiner. Jan 22 at 4.30 at offices of Bin-
ney and Sons, Queen st chambers, Sheffield
Staples, Thomas, Abbey rd, St John's wood, no occupation. Jan 25 at
12 at offices of Fotts, New inn, Strand
Stiles, Bradford, Olorton, Nottingham, Surgeon. Jan 25 at 12 at the
Hop Pole Inn, Olorton. Marshall, Jun, East Retford
Suddaly, Samuel, Beverley, York, Builder. Jan 29 at 3 at the Cross
Keys Inn, Laigraite, Beverley. Turner, Beverley
Swan, William Augustus, Warley, Essex, Messman. Jan 25 at 2 at offices
of Howe, Staple inn, Holborn
Tibley, John (and not Tibley as erroneously printed in the Gazette of
the 8th ult.), Nantwich, Cheshire, Shoe Manufacturer. Jan 25 at 2 at
the Union inn, Nantwich. Lisle, Nantwich
Tuke, Edwin, Manchester, Auctioneer. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Hockin,
Brazenosse st, Manchester

Turner, Thomas, Court of Noke, Hereford, Farmer. Jan 21 at 11 at the Green Dragon Hotel, Hereford. James and Bodenham, Hereford Wakefield, Frederick George, Railway Approach, London Bridge, Out-fitter. Jan 21 at 12 at 111, Cheapside. Carr and Co, Basinghall st. Weston, John, Basinghall st, Financial Agent. Jan 19 at 3 at offices of Morley and Shirreff, Palmerston buildings, Old Broad st. White, Francis Newbery, Melcombe Regis, Dorset, Grocer. Jan 26 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee House, London. Howard, Melcombe Williams, Edwin Stacey, Thornbury, Gloucester, Grocer. Jan 20 at 11 a offices of Clifton, Corn st, Bristol. Williams, John, Liverpool, Butcher. Jan 26 at 3 at offices of Roberts, Commerce court, Lord st, Liverpool. Williams, John Robert, Gloucester, Almondsbury, Farmer. Jan 22 at 2 at offices of Hare, Exchange buildings east, Corn st, Bristol. Barnard, Bristol. Woodcock, George Wells, Upper Walmer, Kent, Grocer. Jan 25 at 11 at 58, Middle st, Deol. Drew. Wootton, John, Bilston, Stafford, Poulterer. Jan 20 at 11 at offices of Fellows, Mount Pleasant, Bilston. Wright, Matthew, Osborne place, Blackheath, Grocer. Jan 21 at 11 at offices of Barnard, Lord st, Liverpool. Davies, Moorgate st. Wyatt, Thomas Eden, Guildford, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. Jan 18 at 2 at the Three Pigeons' Inn, Guildford. Durbidge, Guildford.

TUESDAY, Jan. 12, 1875.

Abrahams, Daniel Steplem, Birmingham, Clothier. Jan 20 at 10.15 at offices of East, Colmore row, Birmingham. Ackroyd, Frank, Manchester, Provision Merchant. Jan 27 at 12 at the Angel Hotel, Dale st, Liverpool. Sutton and Elliott, Manchester Ashton, John, Hollinwood, near Manchester, Builder. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Hardy, St James's square, Manchester. Baker, William, Walsall, Stafford, Stirrup Manufacturer. Jan 25 at 11 at offices of Stanley, Bridge st, Walsall. Barber, John Harry, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st, Wine Merchant. Jan 29 at 12 at offices of Boyce, Abchurch lane. Becroft, William, Bradford, York, Worsted Spinner. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Wavell and Co, George st, Halifax. Brewer, George, Pinkridge, Stafford, Miller. Jan 25 at 11 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st, Birmingham. Burgess, John, Kennington park rd, Tailor. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Reader, Gray's inn square. Cannon, Robert, Ewloe green, Flint, Cattle Dealer. Jan 27 at 12 at offices of Boydell and Co, Pepper st, Chester. Cheesbrough, Isaac, Leeds, Tailor. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Fawcett and Malcolm, Park row, Leeds. Childerhouse, Thomas, North Ormsby, York, Grocer. Jan 25 at 1 at offices of Dobson, Middleborough. Coulthard, Hiram Craven, Delahay st, Westminster, Civil Engineer. Jan 28 at 11 at offices of Chester and Co, Staple inn. Dean, John Hugh, Birmingham, Boot Manufacturer. Jan 21 at 1 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham. Duffett, Frederick William, Bristol, out of business. Jan 22 at 11 at offices of Eserry, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol. Eaststaff, Thomas, Reading, Berks, Grocer. Jan 28 at 11 at offices of Elkins, Forbury, Reading. Eckford, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grain Merchant. Jan 21 at 3 at offices of Hoyle and Co, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Erskine, Charles, Bristol, Travelling Draper. Jan 25 at 11 at offices of Williams and Co, Exchange, Bristol. Erwood, John Edward, Goswell rd, Paper Hanging Manufacturer. Feb 2 at 2 at offices of Vanderpump, Gray's inn square. Farmer, Samuel, Bewdley, Worcester, Cabinet Maker. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Miller and Co, Baxter chambers, Kidderminster. Follett, Robert Bernard Cox, Chickering, Dorset, Bernard Robert Halston Follett, and Edward Way Follett, Brighton, Farmers. Jan 28 at 12 at the Eagle Hotel, Winchester. Andrews and Pope, Dorchester. Forster, Thomas, Knight Rider st, Agent. Jan 21 at 3 at offices of Hudgell, Gresham st. Gray, Gresham st. Gibbons, William, Charlton crescent, Islington green, China Dealer. Jan 27 at 3 at offices of Heathfield, Lincoln's inn fields. Gillies, Robert, Liverpool, Manager. Jan 28 at 3 at offices of Nordon, Cook st, Liverpool. Grant, George, Banbury, Oxford, Pork Butcher. Jan 23 at 3 at the Flying Horse Hotel, Banbury. Pain and Hawtin, Banbury. Harrison, John Barston, Manchester, Landryman. Jan 21 at 3 at offices of Hulston and Lister, Brazennose st, Manchester. Hawkes, Thomas, Haselor, near Aicester, Warwick, Innkeeper. Jan 21 at 11 at offices of Eaden, Bennett's hill, Birmingham. Herbert, Samuel James, Liverpool, Tobacconist. Jan 27 at 3 at offices of Ritson, Dale st, Liverpool. Hickling, William, Barton-in-Fab's, Nottingham, Agricultural Labourer. Jan 27 at 12 at offices of Traman, Victoria st, Nottingham. Humphrey, James, Sunderland, Durham, Wholesale Grocer. Jan 29 at 11 at offices of Snowball and Allison, Nile st, Sunderland. Jackson, John, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Beerseller. Jan 18 at 11 at offices of Topham, High st, West Bromwich. Jacobm, William, High st, Poplar, Tailor. Jan 28 at 3 at offices of Kent, Cheapside. Kent, Red Lion court. Jarvis, Henry, Norwich, Coal Merchant. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Sadd and Linay, Church st, Theatre st, Norwich. Jenkins, Edwin Wiltshire, Stockbridge, Hants, Baker. Jan 20 at 12 at offices of Coxwell and Co, Gloucester square, Southampton. Johnson, Benjamin, Dintree, York, Farmer. Jan 21 at 3 at offices of Burton and Moulding, King st, Wakefield. Johnson, Samuel, Farsley, York, out of business. Jan 26 at 3 at offices of Fawcett and Malcolm, Park row, Leeds. Keay, Edwin George, Birmingham, Boot Manufacturer. Jan 27 at 11 at offices of Griffin, Bennett's hill, Birmingham. Langley, William, Forton Hall, Stafford, Farmer. Jan 27 at 11 at offices of Heane, Newport. Law, William Edwin, Halifax, York, Teacher of Music. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Thomas, Crossley st, Halifax. Lawson, James, Gateshead, Durham, Grocer. Jan 27 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Lee, James Christopher, Birmingham, Draper. Jan 21 at 10.15 at offices of East, Colmore row, Birmingham. Llewellyn, James, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Innkeeper. Jan 22 at 11 at offices of Beddoe, Canon st, Aberdare.

Longbottom, William, and John Walsh, Brighouse, York, Machine Makers. Jan 27 at 3 at the George Hotel, Brighouse. Chambers and Chambers, Brighouse. Jeon Baptiste, Sheffeld, Manufacturer. Jan 21 at 11 at offices of Eam, George st, Sheffeld. Marrett, Joseph, and Michael Marrett, Earlestown, Lancashire, Glass Manufacturers. Jan 25 at 2 at the County Court, Warrington. Nicholson and Co. Mulliner, Joseph Henry, Ardwick, near Manchester, Warehouseman. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Horner, Old Corn Exchange, Hanging Ditch, Manchester. Mylton, Ebenezer, Birmingham, Painter. Jan 21 at 12 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham. Norton, Joseph, Liverpool rd, Islington, General Dealer. Jan 29 at 10 at offices of Gootly, Westminster bridge rd. Nugent, Reginald James Macartney Greville, Surbiton, Surrey, Gent. Jan 26 at 2 at offices of Picard, St James's st, Piccadilly. Browne, St James's st. Ogle, John, Clay Cross, Derby, Hawker. Jan 25 at 10 at offices of Cowdell, Soreley st, Chesterfield. Perry, William, Acton st, Gray's inn rd, Timber Merchant. Feb 2 at 11 at offices of Pullen, Harp lane. Rendle, George Frost, Northam, Devon, Riggar. Jan 22 at 12 at offices of Buse and Co, Bridgeland st, Bideford. Roberts, John, and Henry Roberts, Blegiswade, Bedford, Grocers. Jan 26 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Conquest and Clare, Bedford. Somerville, William, Kennington rd, out of business. Jan 27 at 3 at offices of Pullen, Gresham buildings, Guildhall. Speight, George, Arthur st, Gray's inn rd, Canister Manufacturer. Jan 21 at 3 at offices of Shearman, Little Tower st. Spence, James Underhill, Mincing lane, Cotton Broker. Jan 25 at 1 at offices of Keighley and Co, Philpot lane. Squire, William, Swansea, Glamorgan, Grocer. Jan 25 at 3 at 10, Temple st, Swansea. Glascocks, Swansea. Stanley, Thomas Henry, Southport, Lancashire, out of business. Jan 29 at 11 at offices of Murray, London st, Southport. Stead, Jacob, Warley, Halifax, Commission agent. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Boocock, Silver st, Halifax. Steplemson, John Thomas, Wakefield, York, Boot Maker. Jan 22 at 11 at offices of Barratt and Senior, Wood st, Wakefield. Thomson, Frank, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex, Professor of Music. Jan 22 at 12 at offices of Jones, Harold place, Hastings. Timms, William, Idbury, Oxford, Farmer. Jan 21 at 11 at the White Hart Hotel, High st, Chipping Norton. Saunders, Chipping Norton. Tute, James Thomas, Manchester, Proprietor of Tute's Minstrels. Jan 21 at 11 at offices of Horner, Old Corn Exchange, Hanging Ditch, Manchester. Waddington, William, Leeds, Game Dealer. Jan 21 at 11 at offices of Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds. Walter, Frederick, and Hannah Walter, King's rd, Chelsea, Shoe Manufacturers. Jan 20 at 12 at Mullon's Hotel, Ironmonger lane. King Warman, George, Southampton st, Camberwell, Ties Dealer. Jan 28 at 1 at 1, Hare st, Fleet st. Wetton, Henry Devan, Bristol, Manufacturing Confectioner. Jan 21 at 12 at offices of Benson and Thomas, Broad st, Bristol. Williamson, Weiburn, High Holborn, Engineer. Jan 20 at 2 at offices of Howse, Staple inn, Holborn. Morris, Staple inn, Holborn. Wilson, Joseph, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Provision Merchant. Jan 21 at 12 at offices of Hoyle and Co, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Womersley, George, Eiland, Halifax, York, Beerseller. Jan 25 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Horton st, Halifax. Wood, John, Liverpool, Hatter. Jan 28 at 12 at offices of Vine, Dale st, Liverpool. Brabner, Liverpool. Woodrow, Arthur Henry, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Jan 25 at 2 at offices of Beckingham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol.

FUNERAL REFORM.—The exorbitant items of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NECHROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which survivors may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the Chief Office, 3 Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C.

EDE AND SON.

ROBE MAKERS.

By Special Appointment To HER MAJESTY, THE LORD CHANCELLOR
The Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.
BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSELS' DITTO.
CORPORATION ROBES.
UNIVERSITY AND CLERGY GOWNS, &c.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON.

STOOPING HABITS, ROUND SHOULDERS,
PIGEON CHESTS, and other Deformities, are prevented and cured by wearing DR. CHANDLER'S IMPROVED HYGIENIC CHEST EXPANDING BRACE, for both Sexes of all ages. It strengthens the voice and lungs, relieves indigestion, pains in the chest and back, and is especially recommended to children for assisting the growth, promoting health and symmetry of figure, superseding the use of braces and stays. Price from 10s. 6d. each.—69, Berners street, Oxford-street, W. Illustrated Circulars forwarded.